3.16.2.2.

From the Library of

Professor Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield

Bequeathed by him to

the Library of

Princeton Theological Seminary

THE REVISED VERSION

OF THE

FIRST THREE GOSPELS

CONSIDERED IN

ITS BEARINGS UPON THE RECORD OF
OUR LORD'S WORDS

AND OF INCIDENTS IN HIS LIFE

By F. C. COOK, M.A.,

CANON OF EXETER; CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY TO THE QUEEN;
LATE PREACHER OF LINCOLN'S INN;
EDITOR OF THE 'SPEAKER'S COMMENTARY.'

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1882.

The right of Translation is reserved

TO THE

MASTERS OF THE BENCH AND OTHER MEMBERS

OF THE

HON. SOCIETY OF LINCOLN'S INN

These Pages are Dedicated

IN GRATEFUL REMEMBRANCE OF UNVARYING KINDNESS

BY

THEIR LATE PREACHER

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

FIRST PART—pp. 1-22.

	PAGE
Conditions of Revision	1
Object of this Work	2
Warning of Professor Reiche	3
The Sinaitic MS.	8
Neglect of the Warning and its Results	9
Greek Text of the Revisers	11
Grounds on which it is Commended	13
Extent of Resources	14
How far they are Used	15
Early Fathers and Versions	16
Limits of the present Inquiry	18
Authorities cited in this Work	21

SECOND PART.—Examination of Passages altered in the Revised Version—pp. 23-127.

	PAGE
Section I.—Facts or Sayings preceding or connected with the Nativity	23-32
Matthew i. 7, 8, 10, 11	23
„ 6	24
„ 18	25
Holy Spirit for Holy Ghost	25
The Angelic Salutation, Luke i. 28 ..	26
The Angelic Proclamation, Luke ii. 14 ..	27
Section II.—From the Nativity to the Baptism ..	33-41
Luke ii. 40	33
„ 43	33

PAGE

Luke ii. 49 34
Mark i. 1 35
„ 2 36
Important Testimony of Irenæus 38
Mark i. 5 41

SECTION III.—The Baptism, Temptation, and first Ministrations of our Lord 42–47
Mark i. 9–11 42
Luke iv. 4–5 43
Mark i. 14 44
Mark i. 27 45

SECTION IV.—The Sermon on the Mount 48–67
Matthew v. 4, 5 48
„ 22 49
„ 37, 39 50
„ 44 50
„ vi. 1 51
„ 4 53
„ 10, 12 54
„ 13 56
„ „ 58
„ „ 61
„ 18, 21, 25, 33 62
„ 25 63
„ vii. 2, 4 64
„ 13, 14 65
Luke vi. 20–49 65

SECTION V.—To the Close of our Lord's Ministrations in Galilee 68–79
Mark i. 40 68
Matt. viii. 6, 8 68
Luke vi. 1 69
Mark ii. 16 69
„ 26 69
Luke iv. 18–20 71
Mark vii. 19 72

PAGE

Matt. xiii. 35 73
„ xvii. 21, and Mark ix. 29 74
Mark ix. 43–50 77

SECTION VI.—From Galilee to Jerusalem 80–93
Luke ix. 54, 55 80
„ xi. 2–4 85
„ x. 1, 15 87
„ 41, 42 88
Matt. xix. 9 89
Mark x. 17–22 90
Matthew xix. 16, 17 91
Luke xv. 21 92

SECTION VII.—At Jerusalem 94–116
Mark xi. 3 95
„ 8 96
„ 26 97
The Last Supper, Matt. xxvi. 26–29 .. 98
Luke xxii. 19 98
Gethsemane, Matt. xxvi. 42 100
Mark xiv. 35, 40 100
Luke xxii. 43, 44 101
The first Word on the Cross, Luke xxiii. 34 105
Darkening of the Sun, Luke xxiii. 45 .. 110
Inscription on the Cross, Luke xxiii. 38 .. 112
The Crucifixion, Matt. xxvii. 32–56 .. 113
Matthew xxvii. 49 113
Mark xv. 39 115

SECTION VIII.—Events connected with and following the Resurrection 117–127
Matt. xxviii. 117
Luke xxiv. 3 117
„ 12 118
„ 36, 40 119
Mark xvi. 9 seq. 120
The Ascension and Session at the Right Hand of God, Mark xvi. 19, and Luke xxiv. 51 125

THIRD PART—pp. 128–250.

	PAGE
SECTION I.—On Results of Preceding Inquiry	128
SECTION II.—Classification of Innovations	136
SECTION III.—Result of Classification	142
SECTION IV.—On Value of ℵ and B	148
SECTION V.—Eusebian Recension	159
SECTION VI.—The Alexandrian Codex	184
SECTION VII.—Theory of Syrian Recension	195
SECTION VIII.—Theory of Conflate Readings	205
SECTION IX.—Answers by Members of the Committee of Revisers	219
SECTION X.—Recapitulation and Conclusion	239

THE REVISED VERSION

OF

THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS.

FIRST PART.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS.

Conditions of Revision.

§ 1. In considering the points which are discussed in the following pages, I would ask the reader to keep before his mind the conditions under which the consent of the Southern Convocation was given to the work of Revision.

The first proposal was made by the late Bishop of Winchester (Dr. S. Wilberforce), and seconded by the present Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, on the 10th of February, 1870. It was accepted by the Upper House of Convocation, and passed, the same day, in the following terms:

"That a Committee of both Houses be appointed to report on the desirableness of a Revision of the Authorized Version of the Old and New Testaments, whether by marginal notes or otherwise, in those passages where *plain and clear errors*, whether in the Hebrew or Greek text originally adopted by the translators, or in the translations made from the same, shall on due investigation be found to exist."

A report, in accordance with this resolution, was laid before the Lower House of Convocation on the 10th of May,

1870; and the following resolutions were then adopted after full discussion:

(1) That it is desirable that a Revision of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken.

(2) That the Revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of the Authorized Version.

(3) That in the above resolutions, we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, except where, in the judgment of the most competent scholars, such change is necessary.

(4) That in such necessary changes, the style of the language employed in the existing Version be closely followed.

(5) That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of Revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any [*sic*] eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong.

These resolutions are called FUNDAMENTAL by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol in the Preface to the Revised Version, p. x.

It should be observed that great stress was laid upon these conditions by the proposers and seconders of the resolutions in both Houses. I must call special attention to the words of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol which I quoted in my 'Second Letter to the Bishop of London,' p. 6: "We may be satisfied with the attempt to correct plain and clear errors, but there it is our duty to stop." See *Chronicle of Convocation*, Feb. 1870, p. 83.

The question, therefore, in reference to every alteration is, first, whether it removes a plain and clear error and is thus necessary; and, secondly, whether such alteration is correct.

Object of this work.

§ 2. The principal object of this work is to examine in

detail certain alterations in the Revised Version, whether adopted in the text or suggested in the margin, which affect incidents in our Lord's life, or which are connected with His works and teaching as recorded in the synoptical Gospels.

Alterations are peculiarly important which rest upon changes in the Greek text, and to these I invite special attention; but some changes in the English Version demand, and will receive, due consideration.

I will, however, on the present occasion, pass over altogether, or with slight notice, changes which affect the style of the Revision, without introducing a new sense, or seriously modifying the sense presented in the Authorized Version. These changes in style have produced a strong and a very general impression, which certainly is the reverse of favourable; they have even found severe censors among staunch defenders* of the Revised Version, and have been criticized most effectively by Sir Edmund Beckett; but they are of secondary importance in reference to the point with which I am exclusively concerned, that is to say, the bearings of certain alterations upon the veracity of the sacred writers, or upon points connected with fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith.

Warning of Professor Reiche.

§ 3. Before I enter upon the examination of the passages in question, I venture to invite attention to a fact which appears to be little known, but which has peculiar interest in connection with discussions which have been raised, and appear likely to be carried on with increasing force, in

* I refer among others to Dean Perowne, quoted in an article on the Revisers' style by Dr. Sanday in the *Expositor*, April 1882. Dr. Sanday says: "Viewed with reference to its avowed object, it is nothing less than a failure." Dr. Sanday's article is of importance both because of the learning and great ability of the writer, and his prominent position among the defenders of the Greek text adopted by the Revisers.

reference to the new revision of the text, and to the grounds on which it is defended in Dr. Hort's 'Introduction' to the recent edition of the New Testament, which agrees substantially with the Greek text published by the Revisers at Oxford, under the superintendence of Archdeacon Palmer.

The fact to which I refer is this: some twenty-eight years ago, a German critic, remarkable for extent and accuracy of learning, and for soundness and sobriety of judgment, emphatically called the attention of scholars, and specially of theologians, to the bearings of the enormous changes introduced into the text of the New Testament by the critical school of which at that time Lachmann was the chief representative.

The critic was Dr. J. G. Reiche, and the remarks in question are in his work entitled 'Commentarius Criticus in Novum Testamentum.' The first volume contains a full discussion of the most difficult and weighty passages in the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians; the second volume deals with the minor Epistles of St. Paul; the third with the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Catholic Epistles.

The passage which I now adduce occurs in the preface to the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Reiche begins by observing, (1) that Lachmann adopted without any inquiry the conjecture of Griesbach ("fundamentis admodum infirmis superstructam"), that two forms of the Greek text were introduced about the middle of the second century, one of which was generally adopted in the East, the other in the West; (2) that he produced a new text founded on the three oldest manuscripts then known to scholars, A, B, and C (the Alexandrian and Vatican Codices, and the incomplete but valuable codex known as Ephræmi Rescriptus), with occasional reference to others of the same age and character, always comparing their readings with citations in the works of Origen; (3) when, however,

those authorities differed, he called in the well-known Codex Bezæ, D, for the Gospels; D and E for the Acts; and a second D (the Codex Claromontanus) for the Pauline Epistles, as the best witnesses for the Western recension, especially when they are supported by the old Italic Versions, the Vulgate, and early Latin Fathers; (4) that all other manuscripts, all other Versions and Fathers were utterly neglected by him, as inferior in authority, or completely superfluous; (5) that according to Lachmann and his followers, the one true object of all criticism is to ascertain the text received in the East and West in the fourth century.

Reiche then gives expression to an opinion of extreme gravity, which, on account of its bearing upon burning questions of our own time, I will here quote in his own words:

"Fato quodam sinistro accidit, ut theologi, quorum res agi videbatur, maximam partem, Philologi celeberrimi auctoritate capti, non tantum ea, quæ ille sibi proposuit, nempe textum *quarto seculo in orienti divulgatum* eruere et restituere, reapse effecisse persuaderi passi sint, sed etiam miro errore textum Lachmannianum omnium hucusque editorum optime testatum maximeque a mendis immunem et sincerum repræsentare, quippe a luculentissimis testibus secundum claras et certas artis criticæ regulas efformatum, arbitrarentur. Quo sensim factum est, ut *Lachmannianus* textus fere eandem, quam olim textus receptus habuit, auctoritatem superstitiosam apud multos nacta sit, et ut vulgo tanquam res indubia ponatur, paucos istos libros MSS., quos *Lachmannus* solos adhibuit, ceteris exclusis, non tantum antiquissimæ, quæ *Lachmanno* videbatur, sed primariæ et sinceræ scripturæ testes sponsoresque esse locupletissimos et spectatissimos, præ quibus ceteri testes nihil fere valeant, quæstionemque de externa lectionis

alicujus auctoritate, productis libris istis, præsertim si pauci alii cum iis concinerent, decisam et judicatam esse."

Each point noted in this paragraph demands serious consideration. (1) The strange oversight of theologians, whose special interests were concerned; (2) their persuasion that Lachmann had succeeded in his purpose of discovering and restoring the text generally received in the fourth century throughout the East; (3) their far more serious error in believing that Lachmann's text was the best attested, most free from faults, and purest of all hitherto edited, being derived from the most trustworthy sources, under the guidance of clear and certain rules of the art of criticism; (4) the result being that the text of Lachmann was ere long regarded by many with the superstitious reverence which had formerly attached to the Textus Receptus; (5) and again that it became generally accepted as an indisputable fact that those four manuscripts, which Lachmann used exclusively, were not only the best authorities for the readings which that critic held to be the most ancient, but for the original and unadulterated text of Holy Writ; (6) that compared with these, other witnesses are wholly without authority, and that the question about the external evidence for any reading, when those manuscripts are adduced, especially should they be supported by a few others, is to be regarded as finally and decisively settled.

I will ask the reader to compare these statements with the views set forth, authoritatively and repeatedly, by Dr. Hort in his 'Introduction,' especially in reference to the supreme excellence and unrivalled authority of the text of B—with which, indeed, the Greek text of Westcott and Hort is, with some unimportant exceptions, substantially identical, coinciding in more than nine tenths of the passages which, as materially affecting the character of the synoptic Gospels, I have to discuss.

Reiche then observes that he fully admits the value of those MSS., A, B, C, D, which often retain true readings, either alone or in combination with a few other authorities; but that it is equally true that it is impossible to deny that in very many places (permultis locis) they have false readings, partly attributable to negligence, partly intentional; moreover, that one and all they are either later than, or contemporary with, ancient Versions (a point to which I shall have to refer presently). Reiche then states a fact of primary importance (to which some of our own best critics, *e.g.* Dr. Scrivener, bear witness, but which seems to be strangely overlooked by others), that in the earliest ages the stupidity and licence (socordia et licentia) of copyists was far greater than at any later period, the result being that the most ancient MSS. are tainted with the most numerous and most serious errors (plurimis et gravissimis mendis inquinatos). Moreover that those MSS., to which critics in Germany attach exclusive importance, are of Egyptian, or rather Alexandrian origin, so that all belong to one family, a fact evidenced by their singular consent in peculiar readings; and lastly that all documents of the N. T. coming from Alexandria, at that time the home of over-bold criticism, abound in readings which are manifestly false, "a male sedulis grammaticis natis."

These statements Reiche confirms by a detailed examination of readings in the Epistle to the Hebrews. He shows that separately and collectively those MSS. have unquestionably false readings, especially of omission.

I do not expect that these statements will be generally admitted, to their full extent, by English critics; but they prove at least that the charges brought against the text based upon those MSS. rest on positive scientific grounds, and are not, as seems to be assumed, attributable to a theological bias or mere prejudice on the part of those who

venture to distrust the authorities which have influenced the Revisers in their numerous innovations.

The Sinaitic Codex, ℵ.

§ 4. Since Reiche addressed this warning to his countrymen one considerable addition has been made to the evidences on which modern critics rely. I speak of the Sinaitic Codex—well known by the sign ℵ. In many very important readings that MS. agrees with B, the Vatican Codex; differing however to a great extent from A, C, and still more, as might be expected, from D, the most ancient Western manuscript. To that new MS. Tischendorf, its discoverer and editor, attached, as was natural under the circumstances, immense importance; unfortunately, indeed, such exclusive importance that he went back from the position he had taken in his seventh edition, the best and most interesting for its text, and in his eighth edition introduced more than 3000 variations, of which the larger portion have been given up as untenable by later editors. The effect produced by the first production of this manuscript, conspicuous for its beauty and for its unquestionable antiquity, and by the high authority of Tischendorf, was so great in England that the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, in seconding the motion of Dr. S. Wilberforce, then Bishop of Winchester, for the new Revision, on February 10, 1870, said that "in the Alexandrian manuscript a portion, and a very important portion, of St. Matthew's Gospel is wanting.* We know also that in the celebrated Vatican manuscript the Pastoral Epistles, the Apocalypse, and I think a portion of the Epistle to the Hebrews are wanting; and here we have mysteriously, by the good providence of God, the Sinaitic manuscript, which, in the judgment of the

* The Alexandrian Codex now begins with Matthew xxv. 8; a fact to be borne in mind in reference to all passages taken from the preceding chapters of that Gospel, and discussed in the following notices.

illustrious editor, *takes the first place* among the manuscripts of the New Testament, vouchsafed to us perfect and entire." —*Chronicle of Convocation*, 1870, p. 80.

§ 5. The tendency which Reiche deplores has led in Germany to results on which I need not here dwell. As a general statement it may be said that the effect has been to cast discredit on the great majority of uncials, still more upon the whole mass of cursives, and to detract from the authority of the early Fathers and early Versions to the extent in which they differ from what I may venture to call the Origenistic recension.* In England Alford, with hesitating steps, Tregelles, with bolder strides, have adopted many of the most serious innovations. The outcome of the whole process is presented in the most authoritative form, with consummate skill and in the most peremptory style, by Dr. Hort in the 'Introduction' to the critical edition of Westcott and Hort, published immediately after the appearance of the Revised Version.

Neglect of this warning and the consequences.

There is, however, one great difference between the earlier critics of the school and its chief representatives in England. Even Lachmann and, still more decidedly, Tischendorf attached considerable weight to the evidence of the two very ancient MSS. A and C, and allowed some weight to the other uncials when they agree with each other and those two manuscripts; but the two eminent critics whose counsels evidently predominated in the Committee of Revisers, assign to the Vatican Codex B an authority so pre-eminent, that, with one very extraordinary exception (see further on, p. 16)

* The grounds for this opinion will be considered further on. Here I will simply say that, with some important exceptions, the numerous citations in the works of Origen agree with the Vatican Codex, especially where it is supported by the Sinaitic. This indeed may be inferred from Reiche's account of the process adopted by Griesbach and Lachmann, and it is confirmed by Dr. Hort in his 'Introduction.'

in cases of omission, they follow it without hesitation, and generally introduce its peculiar readings into the text, or, when unable to carry with them the other members of the Committee, place them in the margin of the Revised Version.

Here it must be observed that one of the revising body, the only one among the Revisers who had previously published works of sterling value on the criticism of the New Testament, and who has hitherto been recognized both in England and on the Continent as the leading representative of English critical scholarship, proceeded on a totally different system in his 'Introduction to the critical Study of the New Testament.' Dr. Scrivener attaches due weight to the oldest MSS., assigning the first place to B; but he invariably maintains the claims of the earliest Versions and Fathers, and allows very considerable, certainly not too great, weight to the enormous mass of cursive MSS. when they support a majority of uncials, especially when, as is frequently the case, those which generally agree with B or ℵ present a different reading.

There is no evidence that Dr. Scrivener acquiesced in the decisions of his colleagues; had he done so it would be a result in my opinion much to be deplored, if the account given by one of them* of the mode of proceeding in so vital a question can be relied upon; but it is scarcely possible that he should have surrendered his own convictions, or have departed from the principles so clearly stated and so admirably illustrated in his 'Introduction.'†

---

* I refer to the extraordinary statement of Dr. Newth, quoted in the *Quarterly Review*, October 1881, p. 326. That statement has lately been admitted to be correct by the "Two Revisers." This point will be further discussed in the sequel.

† I am very happy to learn from Dr. Kennedy's 'Ely Lectures on the Revised Version' that I was right in believing that Dr. Scrivener maintains the chief, if not all the positions which he had long and consistently defended.

Here I must be permitted to state my deliberate opinion, held also, as I believe, by many scholars of eminence, that in the case of doubtful or disputed readings no innovations ought to have been adopted in the text, or even in the margin, if they are such as seriously affect the integrity of Holy Scripture or its doctrinal teaching, when there was an irreconcileable difference between the representatives of opposite principles in criticism.

Had that principle been held fast we should have been spared nearly all the shocks caused by the innovations which I shall bring under consideration in the following pages.

The state of the question as to the Revisers' text.

§ 6. The weight, however, of two critics, eminent for learning, ability, and industry, and entirely free from any suspicion of latitudinarian views, confirmed by the corporate authority of the Revisers, had produced so strong an effect, that the question appeared for a time to be generally regarded as at last settled; and that, notwithstanding the serious and most painful innovations introduced into the sacred text. Few persons were prepared for the tremendous onslaught* in the *Quarterly Review* of October 1881, in which the exclusive value attached to the two oldest manuscripts, ℵ and B, was absolutely negatived; and in which the bold assertion was made that the text thus formed is "demonstrably more remote from the evangelic verity than any which has ever yet seen the light."—*Q. R.* p. 368.

Now, in my opinion, it would be at present presumptuous to express a decided opinion as to the proportion of right or wrong in the conflicting statements of the learned author of

* I venture to use this expression, both as indicating the power of the arguments, and also as deprecating the vehemence of the language, in an article which for profound learning, and especially for knowledge of all documents on which the decision of disputed questions in the criticism of the New Testament depends, is entitled to a foremost place in the theological literature of the present age.

that article on the one hand, and of the two great critics Westcott and Hort on the other. It must be borne in mind, however, that in every discussion of the question, attention should be confined to the *facts* advanced by the writers on both sides. Every one will admit at once that violent language is to be deprecated. Those who accept the principal conclusions in that article are well aware that their own cause is damaged by the vehemence of its language. We maintain, however, that every expression likely to give offence can be eliminated from that article without prejudice to the argument; and that the only point worth consideration in the controversy is the singularly complete array of authorities which all critics recognize as highly important, especially of Fathers far more ancient than any manuscripts, and infinitely superior to them in weight, together with the arguments derived from the inspection of manuscripts and from the early Versions. Nor when we read the answers to that article which have been given, as for instance by Dr. Sanday and Dr. Farrar in the *Contemporary Review*, can we fail to observe that, far from confining themselves to those facts and those arguments, both writers dwell, one almost exclusively, upon exaggerations of language, and that they advance statements or suggestions really unworthy of scholars, such for instance as that an article, which, whatever may be thought of its conclusions, is conspicuous for an extent and amount of learning, patristic and critical, without a parallel in this age and country, may have been written by a lady; or again, as the other critic states peremptorily, that the author with all his learning and talent has no "grasp on the central conditions of the problem."* I must also observe that it is not fair in Dr. Farrar to impute to

* See the *Expositor*, December 1881, p. 417. Dr. Sanday has since published a reply in the *Contemporary Review*, to which reference may be made further on.

the author the sin, which of all sins is regarded with special disfavour by the general public, the *odium theologicum*. The writer of that article certainly goes to the extreme in expressing fiery indignation, but he expressly and repeatedly exonerates the critics whom he opposes from any tendency to low or unworthy views and principles in matters of faith. He repeatedly speaks of both as working "with the purest intentions and most laudable industry." With all his heat, that writer abstains from offensive personalities. Nor again can I but remark that appeals to the authority of great names among the Revisers are out of place, especially as we do not know which of them concurred in any particular alteration. No one doubts, certainly the reviewer does not deny or question, the learning or high character of Revisers who had previously been distinguished as theological scholars, some of whom, including the two critics, possessed the full confidence of Churchmen. The question is simply whether in this special department the *ancient* authorities had been fairly and fully appreciated; and to that question any advocate of the Revision should address himself specially or exclusively.

I venture to affirm that up to this time no real effort has been made to grapple with that question, and therefore that no sufficient or satisfactory defence of the Revised Text has appeared.

Grounds on which the Revised Text is commended.

§ 7. I will now inquire with all deference what special grounds there may be for accepting that Revised Text; or, on the other hand, for distrusting it. The grounds for accepting it may be briefly stated. It was commended by two critical scholars, whose authority appears to have been allowed completely to outweigh that of Dr. Scrivener in the hasty and strangely unscientific decisions of the Revisers:* and it is

* See Dr. Newth's account, noticed above.

defended specially on the ground that the critical resources at the disposal of critics at present are not only much more considerable than at any former period, but that they combine all that is really necessary for the establishment of a sound text.

Extent of resources.

§ 8. There can indeed be no question as to the vast extent of our available resources. Most of the uncial MSS. have been carefully examined, and the readings are presented in a compact and scientific form by Tischendorf in his last (eighth) edition. The cursive MSS. however have been but partially collated; and though their testimony is always noticed by Tischendorf, even his last edition does not enable the student to judge of the relative value of those cursives which support, and of those which oppose, the readings adopted in his text. One point of extreme importance is generally neglected. We learn from examination of the notes that a certain number of cursives generally agree, some of them all but constantly, with the recensions represented by B or ℵ—*e.g.* the cursives marked 1, 13, 23, 33, 69, 124, 208, 209; but it is often impossible to ascertain whether these are or are not included in the *al.*, or *al. pl.*, or *plur.* (*i.e.* "others," "many others," "most in number") cited by Tischendorf; and in cases where every kind of evidence is needed this may be of the utmost consequence.

Again, as to the testimony of the early Versions, it is well known that very much remains to be done before the information which they can give is exhausted. Critical editions are greatly needed. So, too, with the early Fathers. The numerous citations in their works need to be critically examined. Again, one very serious defect in editions of most of the Fathers is the absence of complete or satisfactory indices of scriptural quotations; and this is especially to be regretted in the case of the most important ante-Nicene Fathers. For instance, the indices to Clement of Alexan-

dria, who is of the very highest importance in the present question, are incomplete and inaccurate, not only in the editions of Sylburgius and Potter, but, to the grievous disappointment of scholars, in the edition lately printed at the Clarendon Press under the superintendence of Dindorf. Again, as I pointed out in my 'Second Letter to the Bishop of London,' p. 85, Oehler, in his edition of Tertullian, adopts the indices of Rigaltus, with some seriously misleading blunders; thus he gives no less than six references to Mark xvi. 9–20, not one of which is correct, nor have I been able to ascertain whether they rest on any foundation. On the other hand we have full, and, I believe, trustworthy indices to the Apostolic Fathers in the editions of Jacobson and Gebhardt, to Justin Martyr in Otto's edition, and to Origen in the Benedictine edition. Copious and correct indices to the Fathers would be even more valuable than a thorough critical recension of readings, since their authority is most needed and most important on questions independent of minute verbal accuracy.

Still, with all allowance for these deficiencies, it must be fairly admitted that the resources at present existing, and available to scholars, go far to justify the contention on this point of some of the ablest defenders of the new text, adopted as the groundwork of their Version by the Revisers.

Have available resources been used?

§ 9. But the question is not whether these resources are *available*, but whether the Revisers have used them fairly, and fully *availed themselves of them*.

I have read with much care the 'Introduction' of Dr. Hort, which gives an account of the process adopted by himself and Professor Westcott, and gather from it that they use the evidence of early Versions, early Fathers, cursive and uncial MSS., chiefly for the purpose of establishing certain criteria for estimating the relative value of existing MSS. I find that the result to which they attach the highest importance

is that one MS., B, even when it stands alone, has great authority, and that when it is supported by two or three others, it outweighs all other evidence whatever. One singular exception however is to be noted. In cases of omission another MS., D, generally remarkable for interpolations, is taken as affording trustworthy evidence (see p. 6), although it is well known that this MS. is not only notorious for negligence and caprice, but for the number and character of its omissions, especially in the synoptical Gospels.

I will endeavour further on to state to what extent I accept or distrust the MSS. here in question. I now simply call attention to the fact that, in the determination of disputed readings, these critics avail themselves of so small a portion of existing materials, or allow so little weight to others, that the student who follows them has positively less ground for his convictions than former scholars had at any period in the history of modern criticism.

Formerly, indeed up to last year, he would have had before him, demanding his attention, and certainly rewarding conscientious labour, uncials, cursives, early Versions, early Fathers, critical discussions and editions, each and all having just claims to consideration. At present, if he relies on the revising critics, he has simply to ascertain whether two or three, ℵ and B, or B and D, not to speak of L, M, Δ, Π, agree in a text, and he is spared all other inquiry, evidence supporting those authorities being superfluous, evidence contradicting them being *ipso facto* convicted of untrustworthiness.

Authority of early Fathers and Versions.

§ 10. Here again, at the risk of repetition, I must exactly define my position. I would not adduce the earliest Fathers, or even the oldest Versions, as authorities on points of *minute verbal accuracy*, except in cases where they expressly notice variations of the text, when their testimony is of the highest possible value. The Fathers often, indeed generally, quoted from memory; and the early Versions, especially the

so-called Italic and Vulgate, often leave such points undecided—especially as regards the use of articles, the tenses, and prepositions—though some (*e.g.* the Coptic) are remarkably exact even in this respect. But this I maintain, and hold to be an indisputable position, that when the earliest Fathers, up to the end of the third century, cite passages and texts which, in their judgment, and in the estimation of their contemporaries, whether orthodox or not, have important bearings upon the teaching or the integrity of Holy Scripture, their authority outweighs, in some cases infinitely outweighs, the adverse testimony of the MSS.—none earlier than the middle of the fourth century—on which modern critics rely for their most serious innovations.

I will here give but one instance. It is of the utmost importance both as regards the teaching of Scripture and the evidence for its central fact, and also as regards the principles of biblical criticism. I refer to the close of St. Mark's Gospel.* For its genuineness we have the express and most decisive testimony of Irenæus (see p. 38), the highest authority on such a question, not to speak of Justin Martyr † and other early Fathers, the testimony, in other words, of Christendom in its earliest representatives, supported by every ancient Version, even those in which this Gospel is most incompletely preserved, and, with three exceptions, by the absolute totality of MSS., uncial and cursive. Against it the margin tells us that the passage is omitted by the two oldest MSS., a statement which ought to have been modified by the fact that ONE only (ℵ) obliterates all trace of its existence, while the other, B, that which the Revisers hold to be by far the more trustworthy, leaves a blank, contrary to

* For a fuller account of the evidence, and of Dr. Hort's defence of the mutilation, see further on, p. 120 seq.

† Westcott and Hort put a (?) before Justin Martyr, and Dr. Hort attempts to show that his testimony is doubtful. It could not well be clearer.

its invariable use—a circumstance which proves beyond all question the existence of such a close in the original document.

Further on I will consider the general character of these codices. Here I say at once that such an omission of itself is sufficient to impair, if not wholly to destroy, the authority of the MSS. in which it occurs, *where they are without other support;* and that this consideration weighs heavily against the authority of the recension which admits and defends it.

I am happy to learn from Dr. Kennedy's 'Ely Lectures' that on this point Dr. Scrivener retains, as indeed I felt sure he would retain, the decision he had previously announced in his 'Introduction,' resting on what in my opinion are wholly incontrovertible grounds.

Reason for confining this inquiry to these Gospels.

§ 11. In this essay, as I have already stated, I propose to confine my inquiry to the first three Gospels. It is in reference to these, especially to St. Mark and St. Luke, that the most numerous and the most serious innovations (in St. Mark upwards of 600, in St. Luke of 800) are introduced into the Revised Text. There is indeed, so far as I am personally concerned, a special reason why I should endeavour to vindicate this portion of Holy Scripture from what I cannot but regard as mutilation or depravation. When the 'Speaker's Commentary' was first undertaken, I was not specially responsible for any part of the Gospels; but on Dean Mansel's failure of health, I prepared, at his request, the commentary on St. Mark, and, after his death—a most serious loss to our work—I was further charged to complete his notes on St. Matthew, being solely responsible for the last two chapters. I had moreover, very unexpectedly, to revise and complete the Bishop of St. Davids' commentary on St. Luke.

It may be easily conceived with what interest I studied

the Revisers' work on that portion of the New Testament, and how gladly I recognized their agreement on many points of interpretation. But it was with grief and astonishment I found, not only that an enormous quantity of minor changes, generally without acknowledgment, were introduced into the text, but that many passages of paramount importance, passages which touch the record of our Lord's life, of His words and His works, were either omitted altogether, or noted in the margin as of doubtful authority, or were so far modified in form and substance as to convey what I must regard as grievously erroneous impressions.

I felt bound in honour to examine these passages separately and in detail; and I must again ask my readers to bear in mind the conditions on which the work was entrusted to the Committee of Revisers. I venture also to call upon the Revisers themselves to reconsider their own position with reference to their relations with Convocation, and more especially to the general effects or bearings of those innovations.

I trust also they will bear in mind that, although Churchmen who have attacked the Revisers' work have, I believe, invariably abstained from any imputation of doctrinal prepossession, and though their freedom from such prepossession has been testified in the *Guardian*, the *Church Quarterly*, the *Churchman*, and other periodicals of high character, by writers who may be regarded as true representatives of Anglican orthodoxy; yet that a formal allegation to the contrary has been advanced by one of their own body. Referring to the statement "that the doctrines of popular theology remain unaffected, untouched by the results of the Revision," that Reviser says formally: "To the writer any such statement appears to be in the most substantial sense contrary to the facts of the case." See 'Revised Texts and Margins,' by Dr. G. Vance Smith, p. 45.

Such an assertion, if not met by an indignant repudiation, and refuted by substantial arguments, is calculated grievously to affect the position of the Revisers. I doubt whether the statements of Dr. Kennedy (in the 'Ely Lectures'), a man especially conspicuous for learning, and claiming, justly, to be regarded as one whose "orthodoxy cannot be impugned by authority," will altogether meet the tone or bearing of that assertion. Dr. Vance Smith himself would scarcely claim more than is implied by the Canon of Ely in the dedication prefixed to those lectures, where it is said that though the Holy Scriptures contain the materials for the doctrines of which the "decrees of Nicæa and Constantinople," or "the Trinitarian exegesis, which was completed after 600 years and more," are a development, they do not explicitly state those doctrines. Satisfactory—fully satisfactory—as that statement may be, so far as regards the learned Professor's own convictions, it will be regarded by most readers as seriously affecting the sound Anglican doctrine of the sufficiency and exclusive authority of Holy Scripture. Our Church maintains as one of its most fundamental principles that the decrees to which Dr. Kennedy refers are received because they may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Writ, certainly not because they are a development of materials supplied by the Scriptures. That is a principle which assuredly none of the Revisers would call in question; it would indeed be a grievous evil were the representatives of Socinianism entitled to plead, in support of their doctrines, the text of Scripture as it stands in the Revisers' edition.

But I proceed to my own work. In the following pages I propose to examine in detail all passages in which serious innovations have been introduced in the Revised Version. For the sake of clearness and completeness I will deal with them in order of time:

(I.) Passages which refer to facts or sayings preceding or connected with the Nativity of our Lord.

(II.) From the Nativity to the Baptism.

(III.) The Baptism, Temptation, and first Ministrations of our Lord.

(IV.) The Sermon on the Mount.

(V.) To the close of our Lord's Ministrations in Galilee.

(VI.) From Galilee to Jerusalem.

(VII.) The events preceding or connected with the Crucifixion.

(VIII.) The Resurrection and Ascension.

Authorities cited in the following inquiry.

§ 12. For the convenience of the reader I will here very briefly give some account of the authorities referred to in the following notes. They will be discussed more fully in the latter portion of this work.

(i.) MANUSCRIPTS. (*a*) *Uncials, i.e.* written, and therefore cited, in capital letters.

ℵ, Codex Sinaiticus, B, Codex Vaticanus; these are the two oldest, written about the middle of the fourth century.*

A (beginning with Matt. xxv. 8) and C; ancient, not much later than the two oldest MSS.

L, Γ, Δ, Π; late uncials, most frequently agreeing with ℵ or B.

E, F, G, generally agreeing with A.

D, the most ancient, but very corrupt, witness to early Western readings.

(*β*) *Cursives;* these are marked by Arabic numerals, 1, 2, 3, &c.

(ii.) EARLY VERSIONS. (*a*) *Italic,* marked *a, b, c, d, f* (*a* and *b* the best MSS.; *f,* valuable as independent, called also Codex Brixianus).

---

* When ℵ* and B* are cited, the asterisk implies that the reading was subsequently corrected.

(β) *The Vulgate* (*Am*, the best MS., Codex Amiatinus, published by Tischendorf).

(γ) *Syriac Peshito*, most ancient and most valuable, quoted Syr. P.

(δ) *Syriac Cu., i.e.* edited by *Cureton;* ancient, but of doubtful authority.

(ε) *Coptic* and *Sahidic*, ancient and valuable—both Alexandrian.

(iii.) EARLY FATHERS, chiefly ante-Nicene, are quoted by name.

The reader is requested to notice the *proportion* in which these several authorities are used by the Revisers in doubtful passages.

The editions in which the authorities cited in this work are given most fully are the eighth of Tischendorf, and that of Dr. Tregelles.

SECOND PART.

EXAMINATION OF PASSAGES ALTERED IN THE REVISED VERSION.

SECTION I.

FACTS OR SAYINGS PRECEDING OR CONNECTED WITH THE NATIVITY.

(A.) THE GENEALOGY OF OUR LORD.

The Revisers leave the text generally untouched; but in the margin they impute *two plain and clear errors* to the Evangelist. For Asa they tell us that the Greek has Asaph, and for Amon, Amos. See Matt. i. 7, 8, 10, 11.

But by the "Greek" must of course be meant the Gospel as it came from St. Matthew. If the Revisers intended readers to understand either (*a*) that the text is not the production of the Evangelist, or (*b*) that, by such an expression, they simply mean the text which they have seen fit to adopt, they were bound to state their view clearly. As this is the first reference to the margin, I must ask attention to the remarks in the Preface to the Revised Version, p. xix. "These notes fall into four main groups: first, notes specifying such differences of reading as were judged to be of sufficient importance to require a particular notice." It follows that such marginal notes are held to be important; but the note here referred to goes much further. It tells us positively that the Greek, *i.e. the original Gospel,* has Asaph and Amos.

Now it is certain that no one familiar with the Hebrew original or the Septuagint could have committed such blunders. It is quite conceivable that an officious scribe (especially in a time or region noticeable for what Reiche—see above, p. 8—calls *socordia* and *licentia*), who was familiar with the name of Asaph from the inscriptions to the Psalms, and of Amos as that of a great prophet, should foist them into his manuscript; but it is to me perfectly astounding that any critic should throw the responsibility for so positive a misstatement on St. Matthew.

The change is made on the authority of ℵ, B, C, followed by the Egyptian, and some MSS. of early Italic, Versions.

That is, it rests on the recension which from the time of Origen was generally accepted in Egypt. Not completely so however in this case, for L, usually a close follower of B, is exculpated.

Against the change we have all other uncials—Tischendorf cites nine—including several of the Alexandrian school; all cursives but one; the best MSS. of early Italic, and of the Vulgate; the Syriac of Cureton, the Peshito, in all editions, and the Harcleian Version.

I do not see what excuse can be suggested for the Revisers. They were bound either to reject the new reading as a *plain and clear error;* or if, as their marginal note implies, they held it to be the true original reading, they were bound to introduce it into the text.

As it stands it is *one plain and clear error,* whichever alternative is taken.

I do not lay much stress on the omission of ὁ βασιλεύς in *v.* 6. It is a repetition, and, as such, it is easily supplied. But it is noticeable for two reasons: (1) The omission of repetitions is characteristic of the two MSS., ℵ, B, by which it is supported, having with them one uncial, Γ, and two

cursives which generally agree with B. (2) The repetition appears to me emphatic, intended to call our minds forcibly to a cardinal fact in the genealogy, and as such it is retained by all other MSS., uncial and cursive, and by all the best Versions, except the Egyptian.

Matthew i. 18.—We have now to consider the new reading γένεσις for γέννησις and the marginal note. It is of importance, since it disguises the evident reference in *v.* 1 to the first book in the Pentateuch, and obliterates the clear distinction drawn by the Evangelist between the genealogy and the nativity.

The external evidence for each of the two readings is weighty but not conclusive. For the Revised Version stand, as usual, ℵ, B, supported by C, P, and Z and three other uncials of less authority. For the old reading γέννησις eight uncials, including L (showing a fluctuation in the Alexandrian recension), and nearly all cursives. The authority of the MSS. which favour the new reading is materially affected by their extreme carelessness and irregularity in reference to orthography.

The old Versions, with the exception of the Italic and Vulgate, have generally different words here and in *v.* 1.

Of the early Fathers Tischendorf cites Didymus of Alexandria as reading γέννησις. Chrysostom discusses both words, γένεσις and γέννησις, fully in his 4th homily on St. Matthew; the former is taken by him as equivalent to γενεαλογία; the second he explains as referring to the nativity of Jesus Christ. See pp. 48 B, C, ed. Ben.

The internal evidence is of course open to question; to me it appears decidedly in favour of the Authorized Version. See the *Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1881. I agree with the writer of that article, and deprecate the change, not merely as unnecessary, but as inadmissible.

I must now call attention to another point in the same

verse of very grave importance. The marginal note tells us that "*the Holy Spirit*" may be substituted for "*Holy Ghost*" throughout this book; a notice which is repeated in St. Mark.

Does this imply that the marginists object to the word "*Ghost*"? If so, it must be asked, on what grounds? Certainly not as an archaism. The word is in every Churchman's mouth continually. For the sake of consistency? But Dr. Vance Smith complains bitterly of the *inconsistency* of his colleagues in reference to this very question—see 'Texts and Margins,' pp. 7, 8, 45. I would not suggest a doctrinal bias; but to prove that it had no influence a strong, if not unanimous, declaration on the part of the Revisers is called for. Dr. Vance Smith alleges this notice as one of the clearest proofs that the Revision ought in consistency to discard the word as "a *poor and almost obsolete* equivalent for Spirit."

(B.) THE ANGELIC SALUTATION, OR THE ANNUNCIATION. *Luke* i. 28.

The last clause, "*Blessed art thou among women,*" disappears altogether from the text of the Revised Version.

The margin vouchsafes to tell us that "many ancient authorities" add those words.

Would it be inferred from that notice that *all* ancient authorities except ℵ, B, and L (the follower of B), and the Egyptian Version, have the words?

The authorities for the words are remarkable for their independence of each other, and for their weight separately and collectively:

A and C, Alexandrian, of the highest value;

D as witness to Western recension; and five which in doubtful points generally support ℵ and B.

The best ancient Versions and the earliest Fathers, Ter-

tullian ('de Virg.' vol. 6) and Eusebius (D. E. 329 c), so far as their testimony extends, support the old reading.

The omission in the MSS. is attributable either to haste, or carelessness, or possibly to fastidious taste, characteristic of the recension which alone adopts it.

One clear case of mutilation.

(c.) THE ANGELIC PROCLAMATION.—*Luke* ii. 14.

Few points in the discussion are of equal importance. The angelic proclamation of the gospel of peace, in the form adopted in the most solemn of our devotional services, in the earliest and best known utterances of the Greek Church, has been altered in the Greek text, and the alteration is expressed in the Revised Version by a rendering which is not only obscure to the last degree, but, in the opinion of able scholars, is scarcely reconcileable with the laws of language, and least intelligible to the most learned and careful readers.

Here, however, I gladly admit that the adoption of the new reading and rendering cannot be attributed to doctrinal prepossession. Men eminent for piety and soundness in the faith had previously received it (*e.g.* Keble in the 'Christian Year'). Moreover the Revisers have manuscript authority sufficient to prove that their reading was known and adopted by many Churches at a very early time.

We have simply to consider in the first place the external authorities for and against the new reading; in the next place the internal evidence, together with the renderings somewhat doubtfully given in the new text or suggested in the margin.

For the new reading, *εὐδοκίας* in place of *εὐδοκία*, Tischendorf adduces ℵ$^{\text{x}}$, A, B$^{\text{x}}$, D, the Italic, Vulgate, and Gothic Versions.

The asterisks mean that the reading in the text both of ℵ and B was noted as incorrect by a critical scholar at the time when the manuscript was written. See Tischendorf.*

The authority of A, however, is weighty. This is one of the very few instances in which that MS. supports the two somewhat older MSS. in what I cannot but regard as an erroneous innovation.

As for D, the Codex Bezæ, it is far too inaccurate, too strangely capricious, to be entitled to serious consideration; were it not that here, as in many other instances, it represents a very early Western recension.

On the other side stand all other uncials, including those which generally support the readings of B; *sc.* L, Γ, Δ, Λ, Ξ, and, as Tischendorf admits, *every* cursive manuscript.

So far, allowing full weight to the authorities on the other side, we have an enormous preponderance both in number and in variety of independent witnesses. Of course Drs. Westcott and Hort, and, as it would seem, most of the Revisers, reject mere numbers as a test, but in this case numbers do undoubtedly represent the tradition and views of the Church in various quarters.

The old Versions are divided. It has been stated above that the early Italic and the Vulgate have *bonæ voluntatis*, and the Gothic *godis viljins*, "of good will," proving the general adoption of the reading in the West, and its existence in the MS. at Constantinople used by Ulfila.

---

* 'Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum,' p. 4, "σ *erasum*." The duty of the critic, or reviser, was to correct what he regarded as errors of the calligrapher; hence his technical designation, ὁ διορθωτής. The diorthota of the Sinaitic Codex is said by Tischendorf to have done his work carelessly or hastily, but with considerable ability. In this case the erasure of σ is important, for it invalidates the evidence of the MS. The σ must either have been taken from a copy which the diorthota held to be incorrect, or it may have been a blunder of the scribe: to use the words of Eusebius, σφάλμα γραφέως.

But the weight on the other side is far greater. In the first place the Coptic, a certain witness as to the views of the Egyptian Church in the third and fourth century, has ⲟⲩϯⲙⲛⲧϯ ϩⲉⲛ ⲣⲱⲙⲉ = *εὐδοκία ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*, and it is followed by the Æthiopic, which represents the Athanasian tradition, as well as by the Armenian Version—together leaving no room for doubt as to the reading adopted by that very important branch of the Church which was most decidedly under the influence of Origen and his followers.

Both Syriac Versions, in such a question of the highest authority, agree with this reading.

The testimony of the best and earliest Fathers demands careful consideration. We have the Latin translations of passages in which Irenæus and Origen to some extent support the new reading; but in three passages ('c. Cel.,' i. 60; 'In Psal.' xlv. 10; and 'In Joannem,' i. § 13) Origen quotes *εὐδοκία* in Greek. It is quite clear from the words of Irenæus, "suam benignitatem salutis de cælo misit," that he connected *εὐδοκία*—or *εὐδοκίας*, if he had that reading before him—with God. Origen, as we shall see, whatever he may have read, differs from the Revisers totally as to the meaning. As to the other Fathers, the Latins agree with the Revisers, but the Greeks are nearly unanimous against them. Gregory Thaumaturgus, the devoted follower of Origen; Eusebius, thrice, the great authority of the ultra-liberal school in the fourth century; Basil, Epiphanius, Cyril Alex., and from Chrysostom onwards all Greek Fathers, decisively support the old reading.

So far as the *reading* is concerned, I fully admit that, had the Revisers been requested or authorized to notice all variations resting on fair authority, they would have been fully justified in stating, *in the margin*, that some ancient authorities read *εὐδοκίας*; but the introduction of the rendering founded upon that reading into the text, implies

that the Authorized text here contains *a plain and clear error;* and therefore that the alteration is *necessary*, a statement which few, I think, even of those who go farthest with the Revisers, would venture to maintain.

Passing from the reading to the rendering we observe, (1) that the versions in the text and in the margin of the Revised Version are scarcely intelligible; neither, so far as I can judge, is in accordance with the laws of Greek construction; and (2) they are wholly without patristic authority.

(1) "Men in whom he is well pleased" (R. V. text) seems to me impossible as a translation of *ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας*. I do not know whether those Greek words have *any* meaning, but, if they have, they must designate men of a certain quality or character, as the Latins express it, *homines bonæ voluntatis;* or as the Gothic, "men of good will," *godis viljins*. Westcott and Hort, who feel the difficulty and strangeness of the expression, refer to the Hebrew idiom, *i.e. anshē ratzon* (אנשי רצון). But that is not an idiom which occurs at all in the Old Testament.* *Ratzon*, indeed, is a very common word and answers exactly to *εὐδοκία*, but it always refers to the good will of God to man; and as I repeat, it is never found in combination with *man*. If the idiom did occur it would be perplexing, but, if it were explicable, it would mean men of complacency, men who acquiesce in God's will.

The objection to the doctrine, which seems to be involved in the rendering "in whom he is well pleased," appears to me very formidable. It implies that the peace proclaimed by

---

* I observe that Delitzsch, in his Hebrew translation of the New Testament, gives, *as an alternative reading*, and therefore rendering, אנשי רצונו, *anshe retzono*, "men of his good pleasure," which, were it correct, would give a very different meaning from that of the Revisers; but to which the twofold objection must be made, that the phrase has no parallel in the Hebrew Scriptures, and that the suffix *his* has no authority in the Greek text.

the angel is, *not* a reconciliation with humanity as completed in the person of its Great Representative, but with those only who are designated or predestined to salvation. I do not think that the Revisers would accept that view.

What is meant by the marginal rendering "men of good pleasure," I am utterly at a loss to conjecture.

(2) *Patristic authority.* See above. It may here be sufficient to confine myself to Origen's interpretation. Unfortunately we have only the Latin interpretation of his homily on Luke ii. 13–16, but as, on the one hand, it is certain that he read εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις (or τοῖς ἀνθρώποις) εὐδοκίας, so also is it certain that he connected εὐδοκίας with εἰρήνη; and that he understood the passage to mean "and on earth *the peace of good will* to men," *i.e.* the peace of reconciliation. So that while Origen differs from the Authorized Version as to the *form,* he agrees with it entirely as to the substance of the announcement.

Here, however, is the passage in Origen (tom. iii. p. 946 E, Ed. Benedict.): "Diligens scripturæ lector inquirat quomodo Salvator loquitur: *non veni pacem mittere super terram, sed gladium:* et nunc Angeli in ejus nativitate decantant: *supra terram pax.*—Si scriptum esset: *super terram pax,* et hucusque esset finita sententia, recte quæstio nasceretur. Nunc vero in eo quod additum est, hoc est quod post pacem dicitur: *in hominibus bonæ voluntatis,* solvet quæstionem. Pax enim quam non dat Dominus super terram, non est pax bonæ voluntatis."

If I may here venture to put forward my own view of the whole matter, I would suggest that in Italy, or rather in North Africa, a Latin translator found in the manuscript before him εὐδοκίας, probably a mere *lapsus calami,* and, being ill acquainted with Greek, rendered it *bonæ voluntatis.* That reading and that rendering—the latter totally differing *from the text and the marginal note in the R. V.*—were generally

adopted in the Western Church, specially, however, if not exclusively, by African Fathers. The reading was adopted in one Alexandrian recension (doubtfully at first, and it was afterwards rejected), but with a rendering altogether unlike the *Western* or the *modern* in substance and bearing.

On the other hand, the Eastern Churches, and in fact all independent Churches, kept the old reading, the only one known to early Greek Fathers; and when time and opportunity were found for thorough investigation, even the Alexandrians—as represented by the MSS. above cited, and by the Coptic and Æthiopic Versions—restored it to its proper place. So it is found in the ancient Greek Liturgies; so it stands in our Liturgy; and so it will stand, if not undisputed, yet firmly fixed in the minds of Anglican Churchmen.

This single alteration, with its impossible English and liability to doctrinal misrepresentation, would be sufficient seriously to affect the position of the Revisers. I do not see how they can meet the charge of a grave departure from the conditions on which they applied for, and on which they accepted, their trust.

Nor can I conclude without calling serious attention to the fact that the question had been fully discussed, and that a diametrically opposite decision had been maintained, by a most able critical scholar, one whose authority ought to have balanced, if not outweighed, that of the two editors who are specially responsible for the reading. See Scrivener's 'Introduction to the Criticism of the N. T.,' ed. 2, p. 513 seq.

SECTION II.

From the Nativity to the Baptism of our Lord.

So far as regards our Lord's personal history, the alterations in this section do not appear to be of serious importance. But,

(1) As bearing upon the relative value of MSS., I observe that in Luke ii. 40, *πνεύματι* is omitted after *ἐκραταιοῦτο*, certainly not from any doctrinal bias, though not without bearings upon the doctrine of our Lord's humanity.

The change is made on the authority of ℵ, B, D, L, the early Italic and Vulgate, Sahidic and Coptic, the later Syriac and Armenian Versions; against A, an independent witness, and five uncials which usually support B, and the old Syriac and Æthiopic Versions.

The R. V. omits it without notice; a strong, and, I think, an unjustifiable proceeding.

(2) In the same chapter, *v.* 43, R. V. has "his parents" instead of "Joseph and his mother." This change is not important, since St. Luke has "parents" (*γονεῖς*) in *v.* 41, but it is unpleasing. It would almost seem as though St. Luke avoids repeating an expression which might be misunderstood; and eight uncials, two (A and C) of first-class authority, three (X, Δ, Π) generally supporters of B, most cursives, *b*, *c*, *f*, independent witnesses to early Italic, the Gothic, Syriac, and Æthiopic have "Joseph and his mother;" so also the Coptic *

* The edition of the Coptic Version of the New Testament published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, under the superintendence of Dr. Tattam, has been said to be of no value for critical

(ed. of *S. P. C. K.*). The new reading is partly Alexandrian, ℵ, B, L, 1, 13, Sahidic and Coptic; supported by D, which offers simply one instance of usual carelessness.

Surely the change to γονεῖς, fresh in the transcriber's memory from *v.* 41, is most naturally accounted for as a case of *assimilation*—to which, in most instances, Westcott and Hort attach great weight. The old reading needs no correction.

(3) Luke ii. 49.—I cannot think that the Revisers were justified in altering "about my Father's business" of the A. V. and substituting for it "in my Father's house." This may be the true meaning of the Greek, but it is far from certain. With their own marginal alternative, and their somewhat awkward rendering of the Greek, before them, it seems a bold thing to condemn the Authorized Version as being *a plain and clear error*. In fact, "*in the things*" is a very awkward rendering. The Greek is ambiguous, and I believe it is purposely chosen as a comprehensive expression. Our Lord used words which implicitly declared the whole purport of His life on earth; but that was to be "about His Father's business," engaged in His Father's affairs, certainly not simply to be in His Father's house, if by the house is meant the Temple. The Hebrew Version (London, 1849) renders the words בְּעִנְיְנֵי אָבִי. Delitzsch, in his Hebrew Version of the N. T., uses the more general expression בַּאֲשֶׁר לְאָבִי,

---

purposes; and this statement has the authority of an eminent scholar, the present Bishop of Durham, to whom we are indebted for copious notices of MSS. of this and the other Egyptian Versions; see Scrivener's 'Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament,' p. 331. I must, however, quote against this decision the opinion of an excellent critic, of the highest authority on all questions of Egyptian antiquity, Ludwig Stern. In the notices of Coptic literature at the end of his Coptic Grammar, a most important contribution to the knowledge of that language, published 1880, that critic says of this edition, "Werthvolle Prachtausgabe nach guten Handschriften" (page 442).

i.e. "in what belongs to my Father." We want an English expression equally comprehensive.

An unnecessary and unsatisfactory change.

EVENTS PREPARATORY TO OUR LORD'S APPEARANCE AS TEACHER AND KING.

Here we have first to notice the strange and significant changes in the introductory matter of St. Mark's Gospel.

(1) Mark i. 1.—First I must call attention to the omission in the first clause of "Son of God," *υἱοῦ θεοῦ* or *τοῦ θεοῦ*, suggested in the margin.

I notice it with surprise and sorrow. The words are emphatic; they denote with singular force and distinctness the special characteristic of St. Mark's Gospel. As the first Gospel brings before us most prominently the *theocratic King*, the Son of David the king (see above, p. 24) expected by the Hebrews; so the second Gospel dwells specially upon all manifestations of the *Son of God*, in His widest sphere of action, in His relations to Hebrews and Gentiles.

I would venture to refer to my own note on the words in the 'Speaker's Commentary.' It states not my own view merely, but that of some of the most thoughtful and clear-sighted interpreters of Holy Writ. To obliterate this characteristic trait seems to me an act of singular temerity. We inquire on what authority the Revisers rely.

The answer will surely astonish most readers. They have actually but one uncial MS., one which they seldom follow in doubtful cases, the Sinaitic Codex, ℵ, corrected, however, by the diorthota, a contemporary hand; and two cursives, 28, 255. Against the omission, their own highest authority B; the authority to which they attach special importance when it countenances omissions, D; also L, and in a word all other uncials, all other cursives, and without any excep-

tion all ancient Versions. See too the testimony of Irenæus (lib. iii. c. xvi. § 3), quoted a little further on.

As to the omission in ℵ, corrected as it was by the first hand, I do not attribute it to any doctrinal prepossession, but simply to the characteristic negligence, or the haste, of the first transcriber. The words, if inserted, as they were by the first corrector (see Tischendorf, Cod. Sin. p. xlviii.), would have altered the arrangement in *στίχοι* and given the hasty transcriber some trouble. See my remarks on the signs of extreme haste in this Codex, Part III. Section iv.

Tischendorf, however, alleges patristic authority. To that authority I should attach the very highest importance; but it seems to me evident, on referring to the passages which he quotes, that the words were omitted simply on the ground that they had no bearing upon the points in question.

I cannot but regard this omission *as a plain and clear error*, and one of serious importance in the Revised Version.

(2) Mark i. 2.—The Revisers alter the text; instead of "the Prophets," they have "Isaiah the Prophet," informing us in the margin that "some ancient authorities" support the Authorized Version.* They ought surely to have said *many*.

Now one thing is certain. The statement which assigns the two prophecies to Isaiah, as it stands in the R. V., *is a plain and clear error*. The first prophecy belongs to Malachi. The question is simply this. Is the error to be attributed to St. Mark, or to a transcriber?

The ancient critics who adopted it as a recognized reading agreed in one point. To whomsoever it is to be attributed, it was an error of the transcriber. So Eusebius, *γραφέως*

---

* The Greek of Irenæus, iii. 12. 8, p. 467 seqq. ed. Stieren, is taken from Anastasius Sinaita, see p. 39; the quotation in p. 470 is inaccurate. For a positive testimony of Irenæus see the passage quoted below.

ἐστὶ σφάλμα, and Jerome, adopting his words, "nomen Isaiæ putamus additum scriptoris vitio."

There is no question as to its being a very ancient error, however it may have been introduced; and critics who rest exclusively on the oldest extant MSS. could not but accept it, certainly as the oldest and most general, and therefore, in their minds, the only true reading.

They have for them ℵ, B, D,L,Δ—*i.e.* the Eusebian recension supported by the corrupt representative MS. of the Western recension—twenty-five cursives, the Sahidic, and the Vulgate; also two, *not the most important*, Syriac Versions, and some copies of the Coptic.

Against them A, E, F, G^{supp}, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, Γ, Π, uncials remarkable either for general correctness, or for their general agreement with the Eusebian recension; the majority of cursives; two of the best Versions, one independent and of the highest value, the Peshito, the other important for its general accuracy, and in this case as belonging usually to the opposite school, viz. the Coptic, *confirmed* in this instance by the Æthiopic and Armenian.

As to other external authorities it is admitted that the greater number of the Fathers in the East and West, from the fourth century downwards, agree with the new text.

One authority however, which, in my opinion, outweighs all those of later centuries, *sc.* Irenæus, ought to be admitted as most decidedly supporting the reading "in the Prophets." At a merely superficial glance his evidence may be regarded as ambiguous. In one passage (see below) where the text is quoted without special reference to its bearing we find "in the Prophet Isaiah." But in another passage Irenæus has occasion to point out distinctly and fully the whole drift and purport of the second Gospel; and that passage proves incontrovertibly that he had before him, and knew that his adversaries had before them, the reading which alone exonerates

the Evangelist from the charge of ignorance, or inconceivable carelessness. I will quote it at length, both because of its signal importance, and its bearings not merely upon this question, but upon the structure of the Gospel, and especially upon its integrity—see further on, p. 123:

"Quapropter et Marcus interpres et sectator Petri initium evangelicæ conscriptionis fecit sic: 'Initium evangelii Jesu Christi Filii Dei, quemadmodum scriptum est *in prophetis:* Ecce, mitto angelum meum ante faciem tuam, qui præparabit viam tuam. Vox clamantis in deserto: Parate viam Domini, rectas facite semitas ante Deum nostrum.' Manifeste initium evangelii esse dicens *sanctorum prophetarum* voces, et eum, quem ipsi Dominum et Deum confessi sunt, hunc Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi præmonstrans, qui et promiserit ei angelum suum ante faciem ejus missurum; qui erat Joannes, 'in spiritu et virtute Heliæ' clamans in eremo: 'Parate viam Domini, rectas facite semitas ante Deum nostrum.' Quoniam quidem non alium et alium prophetæ annuntiabant Deum, sed unum et eundem, variis autem significationibus et multis appellationibus: multus enim et dives Pater quemadmodum in eo libro qui ante hunc est, ostendimus; et ex ipsis autem prophetis procedente nobis sermone ostendemus. In fine autem evangelii ait Marcus: 'et quidem Dominus Jesus, postquam locutus est eis, receptus est in cælos, et sedet ad dexteram Dei;' confirmans quod a propheta dictum est: 'Dixit Dominus Domino meo: Sede a dextris meis, quoadusque ponam inimicos tuos suppedaneum pedum tuorum.'" Lib. iii. c. x. § 6, p. 461, ed. Stieren.

This full statement leaves no room for doubt as to the testimony of Irenæus, and consequently to the general reception of the old reading in the second century, nearly two hundred years earlier than the oldest witness that can be adduced for the other reading.

In another passage Irenæus refers to the passage in distinct terms, lib. iii. xvi. 3, where the context, as Massuet observes, proves decisively that this was the true reading in the original Greek. (See Stieren's ed. tom. ii. p. 880.) Here is the passage: "Propter hoc et Marcus ait: 'Initium evangelii Jesu Christi Filii Dei, quemadmodum scriptum est *in prophetis:*' unum et eundem sciens Filium Dei Jesum Christum, quia prophetia annuntiatus est," &c. This passage should be noted in reference to the question previously discussed, p. 36.

Once however Irenæus has the name Isaiah, both in the Latin interpretation and in the Greek, as it stands in a very inaccurate form in Anastasius Sinaita (see the notes in Stieren's edition, lib. iii. c. xi. § 8, p. 467). It should be borne in mind, not only that the citation in the 'Hodegos' of Anastasius is loose and inexact, but that the writer, who lived towards the end of the seventh century, was a monk in the convent where the Codex Sinaiticus was lately found, and was doubtless the great authority from a much earlier time. Anastasius would naturally, as a matter of course, in quoting the passage in Irenæus, use the reading with which he was familiar, probably the only one of which he was cognizant. It is unlikely that Irenæus should have had two different texts before him, and we have no alternative but to admit a corruption in this one, or in the two other passages; if so there can be no doubt that the true reading is that which alone is supported by the context.

In questions where external authorities are divided all critics agree as to the propriety of inquiring into internal evidence; and (1) in the first place as to the *usage* of the writer. Now St. Mark differs from other Evangelists in that in his own person he never quotes a prophet by name; once he records a name expressly cited by our Lord; in ch. xiii. 14, where the name Daniel occurs, it is held by critics

to be an interpolation from Matt. xxiv. 15. (2) It is certain that the writer of the Gospel knew that the two prophecies here quoted came from distinct sources, since that of Malachi is translated from the Hebrew, that of Isaiah is taken from the Septuagint. (3) The instances of interpolation of the name of Isaiah are striking, and, in every case where the reading is at all doubtful, of great importance. One of the most remarkable occurs in Matt. xiii. 35, where *Isaiah* is interpolated in the Codex Sinaiticus, and adopted as the true reading by Tischendorf (see further on, p. 73). In Matt. i. 22, D and some early Italic MSS. interpolate *Isaiah*. The former instance is peculiarly instructive as a gross error, the latter as exemplifying a very mischievous habit of early transcribers. (4) No argument is urged more frequently by modern critics than that clear indications of *assimilation* are fatal to any contested reading. But in this passage as given in the Revised Version we have a clear case of assimilation to Matt. iii. 2, the passage most likely to be in the mind of the copyist. In fact St. Luke and St. Matthew quote also the prophecy of Malachi, but *without mentioning his name*. (5) It was natural that a scribe or editor should introduce the name of the prophet best known to himself and to his readers; first probably in the margin as a gloss, which at an early period was transferred to the text. Possibly this process may have occurred in other passages; in one there can be no doubt that an equally gross error was imputed without any authority to St. Matthew, who in a very early text, of Western origin, remarkable for "socordia et licentia," is made to assign our Lord's quotation from the Psalms to Isaiah: an error retained by the Sinaitic Codex and adduced triumphantly by Tischendorf as a proof of its venerable antiquity.

I must also repeat my observation in the 'Speaker's Commentary, New Testament,' vol. i. p. 210, that the reading

ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ, adopted by Tischendorf, and in the Greek text of the Revised Version, is contrary to the use of the New Testament. The name Isaiah occurs twenty-four times; never with the article.

It is assuredly strange to impute to the Evangelist an error natural and excusable in the first innovator and in the transcribers; nor can I regard the consent of modern critics, weighty as it is so far as regards the actual reading at an early period, as conclusive in regard to the original reading, *i.e.* to the words of the Gospel as first delivered by the Evangelist.

One thing is at least certain. The statement in the text as it stands in the Revised Version is more than incorrect; it is *a plain and clear error.*

(3) Mark i. 5.—The Revised Version tells us that *all* the people of Jerusalem went out to John the Baptist.

What St. Mark, according to the Authorized Version, tells us is that people from all Judæa, and they of Jerusalem, went out, and that all who came to him were baptized.

For the new reading they have ℵ^{c}, B, D, K, L, 28, 33, 102, old Italic, Vulgate, and Coptic.

Against it we have (*a*) *The facts* of the case.

(*b*) Nine uncials, most of the cursives, the Peshito, Gothic, and Æthiopian Versions.

I.e. the Western and Alexandrian against Christendom as represented by good MSS. and Versions.

This change has no doctrinal bearing. I look upon it as owing originally to mere oversight, a hasty transcription; but it is of importance, inasmuch as it imputes to the Evangelist an inaccurate statement.

SECTION III.

The Baptism, Temptation, and first Ministrations of our Lord.

(A.) THE BAPTISM.

No alterations of serious importance are made in the record of this transaction ; but some variations are noticeable.

(1) In Mark i. 9, the margin tells us that the Greek has *into the Jordan*. This statement must be perplexing to a reader, who might naturally refer to the last words in St. Matthew's Gospel, on the opposite page, where *into* is rightly used, if taken in the full doctrinal sense.* To "baptize into a river" is not an English idiom.

(2) In *v.* 10, *opened* is altered into *rent*. Now it is certainly not easy, perhaps in this place scarcely possible, to give the precise force of the Greek, which has the present passive participle, σχιζομένους ; but if a new rendering is to be introduced it should not be one that suggests σχισθέντας, or ἐσχισμένους. The Authorized Version should be left alone, or thoroughly corrected and the correction explained. This is a somewhat minute point, but it refers to a minute and somewhat pedantic innovation ; if of any importance, it is

* One of the Revisers, however, Dr. Vance Smith, welcomes the alteration in that most important text as obliterating the evidence for Trinitarian doctrine. Such was certainly not the intention of his colleagues, who are surely bound to protest against his inference. I would ask the reader to note this indication that each translation, I must add each revision, "enthält die Keime einer besondern Theologie." See my 'Second Letter to the Bishop of London,' p. 5, note.

in its bearing upon the Revisers' special claims to accuracy in the use of tenses.

(3) Next comes a change in the text, and of course in the rendering. In *v.* 11, the Authorized Version has *in whom I am well pleased*, the Revised Version *in thee I am well pleased*, reading σοί for ᾧ.

For the change there is the authority of ℵ, B, D^{gr}, L, Δ, and most of the old Versions, *i.e.* of the Eusebian recension.

Against it, however, stand eight uncials, A, independent and weighty, Γ and Π, generally agreeing with B, most cursives, and some Versions.

It is regarded as a case of assimilation, cf. Matt. iv. That of course is possible, to me it seems improbable; but it cannot surely be maintained that the alteration is necessary.

(B.) THE TEMPTATION.

Here I have only to remark that two omissions in St. Luke's account, ch. iv. *vv.* 4 and 5, are scarcely justifiable.

After *bread alone*, even Lachmann has ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι θεοῦ, with eight uncials, *all* known cursives, Latin Versions, Syriac, Gothic, Armenian, and Coptic (ed. Wilkins).

For the new reading ℵ, B, L, the Sahidic, and one edition of the Coptic Version.

Following the same authorities R. V. omits εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν, against the same preponderance of witnesses.

The reader of a copy of St. Luke's Gospel in which these words were omitted must have been sorely perplexed as to the meaning of the words *and he led him up*. Readers now, of course, supply *to a high mountain* from memory; but those Gentiles or Hebrews, who had only this Gospel to lead them, had no such help.

An unnecessary, vexatious, and probably an incorrect alteration.

(c.) OUR LORD'S FIRST PREACHING.

St. Matthew, iv. 17, tells us, in our Lord's own words, that he preached, *Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand* (*μετανοεῖτε, ἤγγικε γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*). St. Mark, i. 14, as his words stand in the Authorized Version, gives the exact purport of that preaching, but in a narrative form: *Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God.* He uses the expression which denotes its special characteristics—*τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*—the glad tidings, the Gospel; and he substitutes for *τῶν οὐρανῶν*—a term which might need explanation for Gentile readers—the unmistakeable word GOD. What our Saviour proclaimed, according to both Evangelists, was the glad tidings that the kingdom of heaven, in other words, of God, was about to be manifested in power.

But the Revisers reject the words *the kingdom*, and introduce an expression which is never used in the Gospels; *sc. the Gospel of God.* Now that expression is in itself quite correct when it occurs, having a definite meaning, both in the Pauline Epistles and what, in this case, is specially important, in the Epistle of St. Mark's own master, St. Peter.

It must however be noted that in those Epistles the meaning of *εὐαγγέλιον* is, *not* the Gospel which proclaims God, but the Gospel *given by God*, or by Christ, when the expression "the Gospel of Christ" occurs. In the Gospels, the word means the glad tidings or announcement of the Person or event which it concerns. In other words, in the Epistles the following genitive is, generally speaking, subjective; in the Gospels it is objective.

Hence it follows that St. Mark, as he speaks in the Authorized Version, is in perfect accordance with St. Matthew so far as the substance of the announcement

is concerned; but *in form* the variation is marked; it suffices to obviate the usual suggestion of probable assimilation.

The statements are distinct and independent.

Now for the authority.

For the Revised Version, as might be expected, ℵ, B, L, 1, 28, 209, Eusebian or Alexandrian, followed by the Coptic, also the Armenian, the Syriac in common editions, and Origen, tom. iv. pp. 161, 170.

For the Authorized Version, nine uncials, including three independent recensions, A, D, and Δ, with Γ and Π, nearly all cursives, the best MSS. of early Italic, the Vulgate and the Syriac according to the best MSS., the Æthiopic, and Gothic.

That is, we have an innovation resting on a very narrow foundation, and hardly reconcileable with the usage of Holy Scripture.

The change appears to me indefensible, especially having regard to the conditions on which the work of revision was entrusted to the Committee.

Mark i. 27.—We have now to consider St. Mark's record of a very important point, viz. the effect produced upon the hearers of our Lord's first discourse, and the witnesses of His first miracle, in the synagogue of Capernaum.

The Authorized Version describes the effect in these terms: "And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What thing is this? What new doctrine is this? for with authority commandeth he even the unclean spirits, and they do obey him."

For the last words the Revised Version substitutes, "What is this? a new teaching! with authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey him."

Here the Revisers give no intimation in the margin that they follow a new reading, or that there is any authority

for that which is followed in the Authorized Version. They simply reject the old reading and rendering, *as a plain and clear error*.

Now that fair authority can be adduced for their innovation is unquestionable; and it is a fact that late editors and commentators accept it generally, on the ground that it presents a vivid picture, characteristic of the second Gospel, and a new and striking thought.

But whether we consider the external or the internal evidence, we meet with facts and reasons which may well make us hesitate before we accept the innovation as the more probable, not to say, with the Revisers, as the only true reading and rendering.

So far as the *words* are concerned, the first clause, *τί ἐστι τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν καί*, is found in ℵ, B, L, and two cursives, 33, 102; but the punctuation rests upon editorial authority only. Tischendorf connects *a new teaching* with the words *with authority;* but Lachmann, who accepts the reading, has a totally different punctuation, in which he is followed by the Revisers: "What is this? a new teaching! with authority he commands even the unclean spirits," &c.

It must also be observed that there is much fluctuation in the MSS. and Versions which support the new reading.

On the other side are arranged eight uncials—two independent and of high authority, A and C; three others which generally agree with ℵ and B; most cursives; and with slight variation, the Syriac, Vulgate, Gothic, Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic Versions; in fact a vast preponderance both as regards numbers and independence.

The internal evidence will be estimated variously according to the taste, feeling, or judgment of critics. I was quite willing, when the question came first before me, to acquiesce in the decision of the critics to whom I have already referred,

and I fully admit the force of their arguments. Yet arguments of no small weight may be urged on the opposite side. It is to be observed that the impression made by our Lord's teaching, its originality and authoritative character, had been previously recorded by the Evangelists, see *v.* 22; here, therefore, it was to be expected that attention would be specially directed to the corroboration of that authority which was supplied by the miraculous act. In my note, p. 210, in the 'Speaker's Commentary' I quoted some remarks of Keim, to the effect that "it was the lot of the greatest Personality which ever appeared in the world, of the most sublime discourse which ever sounded in the world, to be reckoned as less grand, noble, beautiful than the outward result presented to the senses of the people." (See Keim, 'Leben Jesu,' ii. p. 287.) These remarks go beyond the truth; for, as I have pointed out, the admiration of the people had been drawn forth and forcibly expressed when they heard our Lord speak; but we are reminded by them that on the second occasion a far greater variation in the record was to be looked for than is found in the new reading. That variation comes out naturally and forcibly in the words as they stand in the Manuscripts and Versions which support the Authorized Version; and although, taking every point into consideration, I would not maintain that they are the *ipsissima verba* of St. Mark, I certainly would and must maintain that they are entitled to recognition.

Had the Revisers given a place to their rendering in the margin they would, in my opinion, have been justified; had they left the Authorized text intact they would have shown due regard to their trust; but, I say it with reluctance and hesitation, they had no right to substitute their new reading and their new rendering of that reading for the perfectly intelligible and well-supported statement in the Authorized Version.

SECTION IV.

The Sermon on the Mount.

Matt. v.–vii.; *Luke* vi. 20–49.—In considering the Revisers' treatment of this discourse, which, as all critics agree, contains in the most complete and distinct form the very pith and substance of our Lord's ethical and spiritual teaching, we have to call attention not merely to the number, but to the weight and bearing of their alterations. Compared, indeed, with portions of equal extent in the other Evangelists, especially St. Mark and St. Luke, the number of textual innovations is less than might be expected; but some of them are of vital importance.

(1) v. 4, 5.—We first observe in the Beatitudes that a transposition of *vv.* 4 and 5 is noticed, and, as the Preface leads us to conclude, is to some extent commended, in the marginal note.

The transposition is somewhat startling, since it disturbs the sequence of thoughts brought out clearly and forcibly by Chrysostom; nor do I see any internal grounds for presenting it as worthy of consideration.

The reader will be surprised to find on referring to critical editions that it is supported by one uncial only, D,—most remarkable for recklessness and caprice—followed by one cursive only; against the whole body of MSS., uncial (including of course ℵ, B) and cursive, and the most weighty authorities, the best ancient Versions, and those early Fathers who deal specially with the interpretation. The fact that the change is supported by some MSS. of the early

Italic, and countenanced by notices of some ancient Fathers, *e.g.* Origen, might justify a notice in a new critical edition of the New Testament, but in a work intended for general readers, such a statement as that in the margin is unnecessary and misleading.

(2) v. 22.—We next observe the omission of the word εἰκῇ, rendered *without a cause*, in *v.* 22. The omission of a qualification of the general statement, *whosoever is angry with his brother*, rests on the authority of ℵ, B, and (according to Tischendorf *) one other uncial, Δ; but from notices in some early Fathers it may be inferred that the Greek text in some ancient and wide-spread recensions omitted εἰκῇ; and provided that full force were allowed to the present participle ὀργιζόμενος, that word might be dispensed with. This, however, is not the case with the rendering in our Authorized Version, which is retained by the Revisers. To "be angry" does not imply, as the Greek does, habitual or persistent anger, at once sinful, and perilous to him who indulges it. If, therefore, the reading be admitted, we object to the rendering as conveying, if not a false, certainly an incomplete, impression as to our Lord's meaning. And again, considering the very scanty evidence for the omission, and the immense preponderance of authorities against it, we maintain that it ought not to have been adopted in the text.

Here I must remark that the words invariably used in the margin when it refers to ℵ and B, *sc.* "the two oldest MSS.," though literally correct, are practically misleading. The reader would scarcely infer from them that other MSS., such as A, C, are nearly equal in antiquity and conjointly of great authority; or again, that the evidence

* I must refer the reader to the exhaustive discussion of this reading in the *Quarterly Review*, April 1882, pp. 373 seq. Δ ought *not* to have been cited as supporting ℵ, B.

of ℵ and B in many cases is opposed to that of Versions and Fathers at once more ancient and more trustworthy. This is especially important in cases of omission, for which those two MSS. are notorious, and, in spite of the assertion of Dr. Hort, demonstrably conspicuous. This point however will be discussed in the third division of my work.

I am glad to observe that the Revisers do not notice a very grave omission, that of the last portion of *v.* 32, which Westcott and Hort enclose in double brackets. The only uncial manuscript which omits it is D, followed by one cursive, supported by some MSS. of early Italic, and by a notice of Jerome that "nonnulli codices, et græci et latini," have it not. Although the Revisers neither adopt it nor notice it in their margin, it is right to call attention to it as an instance of the singular habit of the two critics of accepting the testimony of D in cases of omission, a habit which in some instances has led to very serious innovations in the Revised Version.

(3) v. 37, 39.—I have examined these two passages, and stated the results at considerable length in my 'Second Letter to the Bishop of London,' pp. 14–17. Here I will simply call attention to two points, the inconsistency of the Revisers' rendering in *v.* 37 and *v.* 39; and the very serious inferences necessarily drawn from the statement thus attributed to our Lord, that all oaths originate with Satan, and that it is wrong to resist an evil man.

I cannot but regard the rejection of the plain, consistent, intelligible, and thoroughly scriptural rendering of these passages in the Authorized Version, as a breach of the contract which bound the Revisers to confine their innovation to cases of *plain and clear error* and to make no changes that were not *necessary*.

(4) v. 44.—We now come to an omission which for character and extent is perfectly astounding. In *v.* 44 all

these words, *bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you,* and again, *despitefully use you and,* are rejected, absolutely, without any marginal notice, of course therefore without the shadow of apology.

Yet this enormous omission rests on the sole authority of ℵ and B, and one cursive which almost invariably follows them, *sc.* 1. Some MSS. of early Italic and Coptic support the omission, and the clauses are also passed over by some early Fathers, not however in a way which justifies the assertion that they were unknown to them.

On the other side we have (1) all other uncials, including of course those which are independent of the Alexandrian recension, *e.g.* D and E; and those which in doubtful passages all but invariably support ℵ, B; (2) the best and earliest Versions; and (3) a phalanx of early Fathers, Irenæus, Theophilus Ant., Athenagoras, Clement Alex., Eusebius, and even Origen, who, among them, bear witness to every word of the omitted clause.

This is really a crucial test of the value of the two oldest MSS. The omission is fatal to their authority. It may be attributed to the haste of the transcribers—a point to which I shall have occasion to refer presently—or to their extreme carelessness. It is one of the worst cases in which they severally or conjointly mutilate the teaching of our Lord.

I can scarcely realize the feelings of a devout reader, on whose memory those sacred loving words are graven in characters of light. Is he to be taught that some unknown daring interpolator went farther than our Blessed Lord in enjoining charity?

This seems to me one of the most indefensible innovations in the new Revision.

(5) vi. 1.—In this verse we meet at once with an expression which must be singularly perplexing to ordinary readers. They will scarcely be able to conjecture what the words

do not your righteousness can possibly mean. They stand without explanation, and for my own part I must confess that I do not know what meaning is attached to them by the Revisers. I presume that they adopt, together with the new word, the exposition of the Latin Fathers, who identify *justitiam* with almsgiving; but if so, they were surely bound to explain a phrase at once novel and ambiguous. It might be understood to mean, do not any good works, works of righteousness, in an ostentatious manner—an excellent precept, but scarcely according with the context.

But what is the authority for altering the Greek text, from ἐλεημοσύνη to δικαιοσύνη?

Simply three uncials, $\aleph^{\text{c.b}}$, B, and D, the latter supported by some MSS. of the early Italic and the Vulgate, attesting the early reception of the new reading in Western Christendom.

Against the reading there are nine uncials, including Z, a palimpsest which generally supports B and is scarcely inferior to it in authority; three which in doubtful readings seldom differ from B., *sc.* L, Δ, and Π, two of high independent value, E and M, and, as Tischendorf admits, all the best cursives, ancient Versions, and Fathers of high authority, Chrysostom, Basil ('Moralia,' tom. ii. p. 251 E, ed. Ben.*).

The question is (1) whether the old reading was a gloss, a true one however, and as such, if not to be retained yet to be borne in mind and its meaning expressed in any new translation; or (2) whether the new reading is not a somewhat pedantic innovation, suggested probably by a critic familiar with the Hebrew, and apparently the old Italic, usage.

It must be admitted that the reading is very ancient and perfectly defensible, on the ground that δικαιοσύνη represents צדקה and its Aramaic equivalent, which are commonly used

* The 'Moralia,' in which this and two other references occur, is a work of high authority but not written by St. Basil.

in the sense of "almsgiving." But if the reading is admitted, the rendering, as it stands, being either unintelligible or misleading, is indefensible. If the reading is admitted on the ground that δικαιοσύνη means almsgiving, it ought to be translated "almsgiving."

It is precisely a case in which the change in language contravenes a "fundamental" resolution of Convocation.

(6) vi. 4.—In the fourth verse of this chapter we find omissions which must strike all readers more or less painfully. In the Greek text the scholar will miss αὐτός, a forcible word: in the English all readers will miss the word *openly* at the end of the verse. The word presents an antithesis to *secretly*, which, if not necessary, accords with our Lord's habit of "emphatic iteration," pressing the point on the attention of His hearers, and for that reason it is urged powerfully by Chrysostom.

The omission, as we should expect, rests on the authority of ℵ, B, supported by Z: also in the former case by L and in the latter by D; the Coptic and Cureton's Syriac Version, all remarkable for omissions. It should always be borne in mind that where D is not supported by early Italic Versions, its various readings are constantly attributable to the notorious negligence or caprice of the transcriber.

The Revised Version does not even deign to notice the old reading: yet it is supported by seven good uncials, by all the best MSS. of early Italic (*a, b, c, f*), and by good patristic authority.

This is surely an inexcusable omission.

(7) The Lord's Prayer.—We now come to the very central and culminating point of our Lord's doctrinal and practical teaching. We have to consider the treatment of our Lord's own Prayer by the Revisers.

Let me first call attention to the innovations in the text. We shall find three.

(*a*) vi. 10.—The first is of little importance, save in a critical point of view. Before γῆς the Revisers omit the definite article. It happens thus, somewhat oddly, that the omission saves them from an innovation in the translation. Our old translators, who had τῆς γῆς before them, disregarded the article, and were right in so doing, since the word *earth* stands out distinctly in antithesis to *heaven*. Had the Revisers retained it, they would probably, if consistent, have rendered it *upon the earth*.

As for the innovation in the text I would simply observe that St. Matthew invariably prefixes the definite article where the whole earth is meant: and again that the omission rests, as usual, wholly on the MSS. ℵ, B, Z, Δ, against all other uncials, all cursives but three, and clear testimonies of Greek Fathers.

An unimportant, but unnecessary change.

(*b*) vi. 12.—The second alteration, in *v.* 12, is of extreme gravity; grave as regards the innovation in the Greek text, graver still as regards its spiritual and practical bearings.

Instead of the *present* ἀφίεμεν, the Revisers have introduced the *aorist*, ἀφήκαμεν.

Now the true rendering of that new reading would be *we forgave:* but the Revisers render it as though, instead of the aorist, they had the perfect tense before them; in their English text they say *we have forgiven.**

The necessity of thus altering the tense, in direct opposition to a rule to which the Revisers attach great importance, adhering to it in many instances where it is scarcely consistent with English idiom, ought surely to have constrained them to question the correctness of the reading. Had they given a literal translation, its unsuitableness would have

* I cannot but call to mind the witty and very true observation of Canon Evans: "One may be tempted to examine the rare curiosity of an aorist buried alive in a perfect."—*Expositor*, 1882, p. 168.

been self-evident. It makes the petitioner, at the time when he asks for forgiveness, declare that he *forgave*, or had already forgiven. The use of the aorist in such idiomatic expressions as *ἐπῄνεσα, ἐδεξάμην, ἤσθην, ἀπέπτυσα, ἐχάρην, ἔμαθον* and the like, rests on a different ground—they are used to show the previous impression of the speaker.

The present tense, on the contrary—that which *the Revisers retain* in St. Luke's report of the Prayer—implies that whenever we offer that Prayer, we plead our will, intention, or our habit of extending to all who trespass against us such forgiveness as we seek for ourselves. The new reading states, as an accomplished fact, that before the petition was offered, the petitioner had forgiven all trespasses, or remitted all debts due to him from every erring brother.

But we have to inquire what authority is adduced for this reading.

Of course we find ℵ, B, the former, however, corrected by a contemporary hand. B is supported by Z and two cursives which belong to the same recension, 1, 124.

On the other side are twelve uncials, five of them, D, E, L, Δ, Π, with an old Hellenistic form *ἀφίομεν*, indicating at once the independence of their testimony, and the dissent of MSS. which usually agree with B; the whole body of cursives; the old Italic; the best edition of the Vulgate (Am.); the Syriac of Cureton without any possibility of misapprehension—it has *nashbuq*—and so also the edition of Schwartze. The Peshito is claimed by Tischendorf for the past tense; it has ܫܒܰܩ the first person plural of Peal, which however *stands for the present* when it denotes a habit or condition, and Walton is right in rendering it *remittimus*. (In fact, the Peshito has the same word in St. Luke, where all MSS. read *ἀφίεμεν*.) To these must be added the Æthiopic, the Gothic, and the Coptic, omitted by Tischendorf—it has ⲛⲧⲉⲛϫⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ; so Arabic نترك—both distinctly *present*.

There can be no doubt as to the preponderance of the most weighty authorities, unless B is accepted as infallible.

We turn to the Fathers. Cyprian and Chrysostom and the Apostolical Constitutions are admitted by Tischendorf to be adverse to the innovation.

Origen is quoted for both readings. The case stands thus: In the treatise on Prayer he *cites* ἀφήκαμεν, but, be it observed, not only for St. Matthew but for St. Luke, where there is *no* variation in the MSS., a fact which of itself throws suspicion upon his text, a suspicion more than confirmed by his own exposition, in which he *twice* reads ἀφίεμεν. We cannot but infer that Origen had that reading before him, and that the variation in the citation is attributable to carelessness either on the part of Origen or more probably of his transcribers and editors.

The alleged testimony of St. Basil, 'Hom. de Jejunio,' § 4 (p. 606 A), would be very weighty, if the homily were written by him, and if, as might be inferred from Tischendorf's notice, he were in that passage quoting the words of the Prayer; but he is simply applying its general teaching to a special case, in which the petitioner is represented as pleading an accomplished act. But the homily itself is spurious and ought not to have been quoted at all. Garnier, the Benedictine editor, says of it (Præf. § xviii.), "Nihil unquam minus Basilianum vidi."

Gregory of Nyssa, tom. i. p. 753 B, appears to have read ἀφήκαμεν, but in the heading of the chapter, he or his editor quotes, not ἀφήκαμεν, but ἀφίεμεν. I should wish to know what is the MS. authority for either or both these distinct and irreconcileable readings.

The general result is surely that this very considerable innovation is disguised by a loose inaccurate rendering, and opposed to an overwhelming preponderance of authorities.

(*c*) *The Doxology.*—The last and crowning alteration in

the Revisers' text of the Lord's Prayer is the total omission of the Doxology. In a marginal note we are told that some ancient authorities support it, but with variations, a statement which of course implies that no dependence is to be placed upon their testimony.

In my 'Second Letter to the Bishop of London' I have referred to this omission. In support of the rejected clause I have noticed the immense preponderance of authorities, especially the consensus of all the Greek Fathers, from Chrysostom onwards, who deal with the interpretation of the Prayer, all of whom agree with that great expositor in maintaining its important bearings upon the preceding petitions. I have also observed that a probable cause may be found for its general omission in early Latin Versions and Fathers, viz., its separation in all the Western liturgies from the preceding petitions by the intercalated Embolismus; to this I may add that in the controversies with the Marcionites, which occupied to so great an extent the minds of early Latin Fathers, the form of the Prayer found in St. Luke's Gospel would naturally be quoted, since no question was raised as to the reception of that Gospel.

I will now briefly state the authorities on which the Revisers rely and those which they reject.

Of course we find ℵ, B, supported however by D and Z (Western and Alexandrian), the early Italic, the Vulgate, the Latin Fathers Tertullian and Cyprian, and Origen.

That is, the Eusebian recension of the third and fourth centuries, the Western from the second to the fifth or sixth.

On the other side are all other uncials, including those which in doubtful cases, as a rule, agree with B. Unfortunately two most important witnesses here fail us, A and C. Were the missing portion of the MS. of A extant, there can be little doubt as to its testimony; it generally agrees with

E and G, which are here supported by K, L, M, S, U, V, Δ, and Π, independent witnesses; and by nearly all cursive MSS.; also by one independent and important MS. of the early Italic, *f* (the Codex Brixianus); by all the Syriac Versions, three independent witnesses, each weighty, and collectively of the highest importance; the Gothic, Slavonic, and, note this, the two Egyptian Versions, Sahidic and Coptic, followed by the Æthiopic. The variation to which the Revisers refer suffices to prove the absolute independence of this "cloud of witnesses;" it certainly does not detract from their authority in a passage where the general import is all in all.

The Revisers would have been justified had they given a marginal note stating an omission from some ancient authorities; it might be too much to expect that the critics by whom they were guided would consent to add that of the MSS. which they follow, two are conspicuous for omissions, that one, Z, belongs to the same recension, and that the other, D, is notorious for negligence and caprice.

I have also to add that we now learn from Dr. Kennedy's 'Ely Lectures' that Dr. Scrivener, as might be expected from his previous statements, holds that there are not sufficient grounds for such omission.

To expunge the whole clause from the text was a stretch of arbitrary power against which, in my opinion, Churchmen are entitled to remonstrate strongly; and for which it is scarcely conceivable that Convocation will accept the responsibility.

From the alterations in the text I pass on to alterations in the rendering.

(8) In addition to that alteration which has been already discussed, we find (*a*) *bring* for *lead*, a change questionable as to English idiom, and generally admitted to be unnecessary. The word *lead* surely expresses the full meaning of εἰσενέγκῃς, whether as regards its etymology, = *cause to go* (see Müller,

'Englische Etymologie,' *s.v.*), or its general use. The Bishop of Durham, a very high authority as to the sense of the Greek, states that in his opinion the change is a necessary one, but he does not state what precise shade of meaning he considers sufficiently important to compel or justify the change. In fact, so far as I can judge, most readers will find it difficult to ascertain whether *bring* or *lead* is the stronger term. Dr. Kennedy says that in both Gospels the Greek means *bring*, and that *lead* is an over strong and painful word drawn from the Vulgate; he attributes it indeed to Jerome's characteristic violence. It is strange that so learned a man should not have referred to the early Italic Versions before he pronounced this sentence upon Jerome. In all the MSS. of early Italic we have one and the same rendering, *ne nos inducas*—the only one, in fact, which appears to have been known to the Latin Fathers, see the expositions of the Lord's Prayer by Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine. On the other hand I should rather have understood the word *bring* to denote an act independent of, or controlling, the will of the petitioner. I believe that readers will generally agree in preferring the English of the old translators to that of the Revisers.*

(*b*) *Daily.*—This word is retained, but with an exposition in the margin which is scarcely consistent with its natural and obvious meaning. The reader may, and probably will, understand that exposition, *for the coming day*, to refer to a supply of food sufficient for the day in which the petition is

* I subjoin this note as expressing the judgment of an able scholar:—"I suppose the Revisers would defend themselves by saying that 'lead' implies an action on the will, 'bring' an action of external circumstances, and the latter is what the Greek implies. But the distinction is too subtle for ordinary readers and the change is useless and unnecessary." This is in fact the ground taken by Mr. Humphry, an excellent authority; but it certainly implies that "bring" is a stronger and, I should suppose, therefore a more painful word than "lead."

offered. Such, however, is not the meaning attached to it by the Revisers; if, as may be assumed, they adopt the Bishop of Durham's learned and able exposition. He holds that the word means "the bread of to-morrow," a meaning which could have been clearly stated in the margin, had the Revisers accepted his arguments as conclusive.

I will not here enter upon the very difficult controversy as to the exact meaning and etymology of ἐπιούσιος, a word absolutely unknown in classic or Hellenistic Greek. I may observe that in the corrupt so-called Gospel of the Hebrews, the word "to-morrow" is adopted, yet that most of the old Versions (I believe all but one, the Memphitic, which has ⲣⲁⲥⲧ, *i.e.* to-morrow), and, so far as I am aware, all early Christian Fathers, understood it to refer to the supply of our immediate wants. Chrysostom explains it as ἐφήμερος, without note or comment, as a point generally understood; and to go much further back, Clement of Alexandria (Strom. viii. c. xiii.) regards it as the proper antithesis to περιούσιος.* When, however, the alternative derivation from ἐπιών, with reference to ἐπιοῦσα, was generally adopted, it was as generally understood by the Fathers to refer to spiritual food, the food of the eternal morrow. See the collection of passages in Dr. McClellan's 'Gospels.'

Here we gladly welcome the retention of the old word in the text; but the marginal exposition of the Greek, if correct in sense, is, to say the least, obscure and misleading in expression. To use the words of a learned friend, "The fact is that the bread that we pray for is 'future,' in the same sense in which *all* objects of prayer are 'future.' But the marginal explanation of the Revisers leads to a supposition

* I would specially call attention to the whole context of this passage. Clement, like his great namesake of Rome (see my 'Second Letter to the Bishop of London,' p. 57), gives what may be regarded as a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer, and, like him, discards all reference to Satan.

that in *this* instance we are to think of a more distant future."

The Syriac of Cureton renders the word *amīna, i.e.* constant, to be relied upon. Cureton in his preface, at p. xviii., says truly that "we have, *v.* 11, 'constant of the day,' *amīna d'yôma,* which agrees exactly with *quotidianum* of the old Latin, *a, b, c,* and with the reading of Cyprian. The Gothic Version also uses a term meaning continual." The Gothic word is *sinteinan,* in the nominative *sinteins,* which probably means *continuous,* nearly equivalent to *daily,* as indeed Massman renders it in his vocabulary to Ulfila.

(*c*) *Deliver us from evil.*—I must refer to my very long discussion of this passage, to which an answer by the Bishop of Durham may be looked for. Here I will simply notice the facts (1) that the new rendering "the evil one" is an innovation in language, the word *wicked* being invariably used by the Authorized Version in speaking of Satan; (2) that it narrows the broad, comprehensive sense of the Greek; (3) that it implies incompleteness in the deliverance already accomplished by our Lord; (4) that it has no counterpart or justification in the New Testament; (5) that it is opposed to the interpretation adopted by all the Churches of Western Christendom; and (6) that it absolutely ignores the safeguard supplied by the Doxology, on which special stress is laid by all the best expositors of the Greek Church, from Chrysostom onwards.

I must add that so far from the Revisers being all but unanimous in their interpretation of the passage, four have publicly declared their dissent. One other scholar,* well known for his learning and soundness in the faith, was

* I refer to Mr. Humphry. In his pamphlet entitled 'A Word on the Revised Version of the New Testament,' p. 25, he informs us that "he resisted it as long as he could," and that the change was finally adopted after the circulation of a paper in its defence by one of the members.

decidedly adverse to its adoption, and struggled against it to the last; and lastly, Dr. Kennedy, in the Dedication prefixed to his 'Ely Lectures on the Revised Version,' published this year, writes thus, p. x.: "Once I voted for placing 'evil one' in the margin; later on, feeling the strength of the argument for the masculine, I did not vote, and I am afraid I still doubt on which side the scale of obligation preponderates." In a subsequent lecture he doubts whether the protest of the margin ought not to content "those who hold to the concrete sense," p. 72.

The Bishop of Lincoln, who in a brief note on the Gospel of St. Matthew had previously adopted the new rendering, has lately written to me saying that "there can be no doubt that the Revisers acted *ultra vires* in making the alteration; and that the general term *evil* is preferable to *the evil one*."

I express no further opinion upon this point. The reader will decide whether my arguments or those which have been, or will be, adduced by the Bishop of Durham, preponderate; or rather, whether his arguments amount to a proof that our Authorized Version is a *plain and clear error*.

FROM THE LORD'S PRAYER TO THE END OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

Few changes are suggested by the Revisers so far as regards the Gospel of St. Matthew.

(9) One omission, c. vi. 18, rests on good authority; two, of no importance theologically, are noticeable from a critical point of view; in *v.* 21, σου for ὑμῶν is adopted from ℵ and B against all MSS. and Versions; and in *v.* 25, ἤ for καί follows B alone. In *v.* 33 the Revisers omit τοῦ θεοῦ, following ℵ, B, against all MSS. and Versions, and the distinct testimony of the early Fathers, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and Cyprian.

(10) vi. 25.—The Revisers seem to claim and to receive much credit for the substitution of "be not anxious" in place of "take no thought." It is selected by my old friend Archdeacon Allen, as one of those changes which justify a demand for immediate adoption, and Dr. Farrar, in the *Contemporary Review*, defends the use of the word "anxious" —strange, as he admits, to the present New Testament—as necessary, on the ground of its correcting a wrong impression, and precluding practical misuse. This opinion is shared by persons whose judgment is very weighty, both as scholars, and as practically acquainted with the impression made upon the generality of readers by the words in the Authorized Version. To me, however, the old rendering appears preferable. The word μεριμνάω comprises all forms of mental agitation, whether painful and distressing, or merely speculative—in short, preoccupation of the thoughts about future contingencies. The word "anxious" is not sufficiently comprehensive; it narrows the sense; it is true as far as it extends, but it certainly does not cover the meaning and practical bearings involved in the significant but somewhat rare word μεριμνάω as used in classical and biblical Greek.*

* Apart from this passage and the corresponding clause in St. Luke the word occurs but twice in the Gospels: Matthew x. 19, where it means turning over in one's mind, casting about for topics in an apologetic speech, a process which of course is accompanied with anxiety, but is mainly objectionable on the ground of its involving mental distraction. The Christian, as St. Peter writes, *should be always ready to give an answer*, a condition which is the true preservative against undue excitement. In Luke x. 41 (where the Revisers have "thou art anxious" in the text, *but suggest omission in the margin*), it is connected with τυρβάζῃ and applies to unnecessary worrying about small domestic matters. It occurs four times in St. Paul's Epistles: twice in 1 Corinthians, vii. 23–24, and xii. 35. In the latter passage it is commended, being an unselfish thoughtfulness: so, too, in Phil. ii. 20; in Phil. iv. 6 Bishop Ellicott renders it *be anxious*, a rendering adopted by the Revisers, and also by Dean Gwynne in the 'Speaker's Commentary;' a shade of meaning which is appropriate to that passage, but is far from exhausting the significance of the verb.

Our Lord would not merely save His followers from distressful thoughts, from painful anxieties, but heal them of the disease of worldliness, of which one of the very commonest and most mischievous symptoms is the feeling throroughly well expressed by the words "taking thought," a process sometimes painful, but always attractive and engrossing to the speculator, the day-dreamer, the busy housewife, the over-careful parent. The Revisers would scarcely venture to reject that phrase as an archaism. It is familiar to the readers of Shakespeare, and ought to have been impressed upon the minds of Christians generally, with all its train of associations and practical bearings. It is said, however, to be generally misunderstood. If that be the case, a brief marginal note might surely suffice. The removal of the word from the text seems to me a palpable infringement of one fundamental resolution of Convocation. I trust that when the range of language has been fully considered, the old, pregnant, comprehensive, and adequate rendering *take no thought* will be preserved. If, indeed, it need to be explained, great care should be taken that the exposition be true, neither narrowing the sense, as the word "anxious" certainly does, nor widening it so as to include due care, the wise foresight which our Lord repeatedly enjoins, which He condemns the careless and thoughtless for neglecting.

The other alterations in St. Matthew's account of the Sermon on the Mount are not of importance.

(11) In c. vii. 2, *μετρηθήσεται* for *ἀντιμετρηθήσεται* is a correction supported by all uncial MSS. The old reading is evidently a gloss, a good one, but not to be retained in the text.

(12) vii. 4. *ἐκ* for *ἀπό*.—The word *ἐκ* is physically correct, but *ἀπό* is better as referring to the intention.

The new reading follows ℵ, B, against all other uncials. In *v.* 5, *ἐκ* is generally adopted. The intention has been

marked sufficiently by the old reading in the preceding clause; the act itself is now distinctly described.

(13) vii. 13.—The marginal note suggests the omission of ἡ πύλη, *the gate,* which has *all uncials* but one in its favour, and all Versions, except the early Italic.

The preference thus given to ℵ* is hardly to be accounted for save on the ground that omissions, in the Revisers' judgment, have a *prima facie* claim to acceptance. In the Appendix to Westcott and Hort's 'Introduction,' p. 10, Dr. Hort has a highly ingenious, but over-subtle, discussion in defence of the omission. It can scarcely convince any one who has not adopted the general views of the two critics.

(14) For ὅτι in *v.* 14, the marginal note suggests τί: *How narrow is the gate.*

For this change there is strong support, but it is noticeable that neither ℵ nor B, the chief authorities with the Revisers, has that reading. The cursive MSS. are divided; Tischendorf says "ὅτι al. haud dubie mu." That is, very many certainly have the old reading.

I doubt both the new reading—which seems to me less in accordance with our Lord's noble and simple style—and the rendering. Can τί mean *how*? It is a meaning which seems to me wholly without support.

The rest of the discourse is left untouched in St. Matthew.

(15) But we must here call attention to the treatment of the discourse as recorded by St. Luke, vi. 20–49.

In those twenty-nine verses twenty alterations are made, twelve of them omissions of the usual character, resting on the usual authorities, but of no material importance.

In *v.* 35, the very difficult reading μηδένα for μηδέν is suggested in the margin as read by some ancient authorities. The rendering in the text, *never despairing,* is not satisfactory; that in the margin, *despairing of no man,* is intelligible, but seems to me to savour of Alexandrian subtlety.

For the old reading there is an enormous preponderance of MSS., including B and its ordinary satellites.

The new rests on ℵ, with Ξ and Π, authorities followed by Tischendorf in his eighth edition, but comparatively seldom by Westcott and Hort.

But the discourse, as reported by St. Luke, is disfigured at its close, *v.* 48, by an innovation, unsurpassed for its absurdity, in most absolute and direct opposition to our Lord's own teaching as recorded by both Evangelists.

Instead of *it was founded on a rock*, or, as the marginal note renders the old reading, *it had been founded* on the rock, the Revised Version introduces into the text *because it had been well builded.*

A reason for the fall of the house is thus given totally different from that which is distinctly pointed out by our Lord's words in the preceding verse, and is distinctly recorded by St. Matthew.

The fall of the house, in fact, had absolutely nothing to do with the superstructure; it was simply and entirely owing to the insecurity of the soil on which it stood. The choice of the foundation is the distinctive characteristic of the two classes of builders.

It may be assumed as an undoubted fact that our Lord's own teaching is correctly reported by St. Matthew. Whether He delivered the discourse on two several occasions or not, has little to do with the present question. One thing is sure: His teaching was consistent; His meaning was not open to ambiguity.

The question is simply this. Does St. Luke himself report incorrectly our Lord's words, does he grievously misrepresent them? or has some tasteless, reckless innovator, whether carelessly or intentionally, introduced, first, probably, a senseless gloss, then a mischievous corruption, into the Gospel?

The special characteristics of St. Luke's Gospel, remark-

able for grace, beauty, keen and loving appreciation of our Lord's teaching, must be borne in mind; nor should it be forgotten that his whole character was moulded under the influence of St. Paul, who above all things enforced the great principle of attending, if not exclusively, yet invariably and primarily to the *foundation*.

For the new reading four uncials, Alexandrian or Eusebian, are solely responsible, *sc.* ℵ, B, L, Ξ, and two cursives.

The Coptic Version has *it was well built*, but adds the all-important words *upon a rock*, not *the rock* (ϵϫϵⲛ ⲟⲩⲡϵⲧⲣⲁ). This reading seems to mark the origin of this wretched variation. First καλῶς was inserted—useless but not affecting the substance—then "a rock" was omitted, giving thus exclusive weight to the interpolated καλῶς.

I venture to assert that such a reading as this, having regard to all its bearings, is sufficient to impair, if not altogether to overthrow, the authority of the MSS. which support it. It seems to me very strange that Dr. Hort does not state, in the appendix to his 'Introduction,' his reasons for adopting a reading so extraordinary.

(16) What shall we say generally of the treatment of the Sermon on the Mount by the Revisers?

What points of any real importance have they amended?

What points have they damaged? They have suggested a transposition in the Beatitudes; they have mutilated some of the most characteristic injunctions of our Lord; they have left the Lord's Prayer in an incomplete, and I cannot but maintain, a corrupt form; while they have utterly demolished the principle set forth forcibly and completely in the concluding parable as recorded by St. Luke.

I ask again whether these changes are not wholly inconsistent with the conditions proposed by themselves, formally sanctioned by Convocation, and accepted as fundamental in the Preface to the Revised Version.

SECTION V.

To the Close of our Lord's Ministry in Galilee.

(A.) From the Sermon on the Mount to the Parables.

Matt. viii.–xiii.; *Mark* i. 40–iv.; *Luke* viii.

(1) I will not dwell on points which do not affect the substance of our Lord's teaching or the verity of the narrative, although in some instances the changes are vexatious, and certainly unnecessary. Thus *e.g.* in St. Mark's account, i. 40, of the healing of the first leper the words which are in substantial, *not verbal*, accordance with St. Matthew, expressing deep reverence, "and kneeling down to him" (*γονυπετῶν αὐτόν*), are noted in the margin as omitted by *some ancient authorities*. In this case B and D—the two principal authorities, the latter specially in cases of omission, with Westcott and Hort—are supported by two late uncials, G and Γ, but opposed by ℵ and L, and all other MSS. and ancient Versions. Westcott and Hort in their own edition enclose the words in brackets; evidently they could not persuade the Revisers to adopt their own reading in the text; unfortunately it is almost equally mischievous in the margin.

(2) In the account of the healing of the centurion's servant, Matthew viii. 6, 8, I notice with regret that in the margin *boy* is suggested in place of *servant*. This apparently countenances an interpretation, repudiated by most commentators, that the centurion was entreating on behalf of his own child; a point which alters the character of the transaction, and is not without effect upon a grave question touching the harmony of the Gospels.

Nor do I regard the marginal change in *v.* 10 as satisfactory. It is certainly obscure, if it does not alter the sense, and the Revisers were evidently unwilling to admit it into their text.

(3) Luke vi. 1.—I must, however, call special attention to the extraordinary acceptance of a very indefensible omission in the text of Luke vi. 1. There δευτεροπρώτῳ is omitted altogether in the text, although it is defended in the margin. In the first place the omission of the word affects the narrative. The word is peculiar, it does not occur elsewhere, but it most probably means the first Sunday in the second month (*Iyar**), precisely the time when wheat would be fully ripe, and it thus gives singular vividness to St. Luke's account, impressing readers unconsciously with its exact veracity. In the next place the omission bears upon the character of the MSS. which alone are responsible for the blunder, ℵ, B, L. Even Tischendorf rejects it, observing truly "ut ab additamenti ratione alienum est, ita cur omiserint in promptu est."

(4) In Mark ii. 16 ℵ, B, and D omit the words "and drinketh"—a point chiefly noticeable as an instance of the singular weight attached by Westcott and Hort to D in cases of omissions, *because* it is generally remarkable for interpolations. In the Gospels that MS. is not less conspicuous for careless or hasty omissions. The Revisers do not accept the omission in their English text, but they allow it a place in the margin.

(5) In the 26th verse of this chapter we meet with a very serious innovation, presented in the most distinct form in the Revised Version. Instead of "in the days of Abiathar the High Priest" we are told to read "when Abiathar was High Priest." The importance of this change might possibly escape the notice of general readers; but it has been pointed

* See note in the 'Speaker's Commentary.'

out forcibly and conclusively by the *Quarterly* Reviewer, and by the learned Bishop of Lincoln. The old reading simply states the fact that Abiathar, well known as the High Priest appointed by David himself at a much later period, was present when the young David with his attendants ate the shew bread. What the Revisers make our Lord say, is that Abiathar was High Priest at that time. A grosser anachronism could scarcely be committed, and here it is distinctly imputed to our Lord Himself, on the authority of St. Mark, the Petrine Evangelist.

This extraordinary falsification of well-known history is effected by the simple omission of the definite article (τοῦ) before High Priest. Had evidence of very early omission been adduced the question would still have been whether the gross error was to be imputed to the Evangelist, or to a scribe careless or in haste, and probably unconscious of its bearings, and that question could surely have elicited but one answer. In the case of a secular writer, had such an anachronism, resting on a single word, been detected in a MS. say of Polybius, or any historian of character, no critic would have hesitated to have condemned it as the manifest blunder of a transcriber. But in this instance we find it only in the two ancient MSS. remarkable for the number of their omissions, ℵ and B, followed by two much later uncials, well known as their satellites; against them stand A and C, two weighty and independent authorities, but little later in point of age, and free from their characteristic defects, with Δ and Π, and the cursives 1, 33, 69, all five remarkable for their general agreement with ℵ and B.

That this is *a plain and clear error,* is a fact absolutely indisputable; and it is attributed by the Revisers, in their new text, to our Lord or to the Evangelist.

Can it be doubted that it is a *plain and clear error* of the Revisers?

OUR LORD'S DISCOURSE AT NAZARETH.—*Luke* iv. 18–20.—In this most important discourse, in which, in His own native place, our Lord formally claimed for Himself the fulfilment of one of the most striking Messianic prophecies, especially precious as describing the characteristic features of His personality, we are startled by the omission of the words "to heal the broken-hearted" (*v.* 19).

For this omission we have, as we should expect, the same authorities ℵ and B, supported, however, by later MSS. of the same recension, L and Ξ; and by D with other early Western witnesses; also the Coptic and Æthiopic (as edited) Versions. These suffice to prove that the omission existed at an early period, and that it was accepted, probably because it was not noticed, by Egyptian transcribers.

Against it are arrayed:—(1) The Hebrew original, which our Lord had in His hands, and which He undoubtedly read in the synagogue without omitting any words, especially words expressive of tenderest sympathy. (2) Abundance of competent and independent witnesses—nine uncials, five of which generally agree with B, most cursives, some of the best MSS. of early Italic and Vulgate, the Syriac in all its forms, the Gothic, and MSS. of Æthiopic; of the Fathers, the earliest, in such a case the most trustworthy, Irenæus.

Is it conceivable that any one will venture to assert that these most blessed words are a *plain and clear error*? As for the omission, I attribute it simply to carelessness on the part of D and those early Italic transcribers who omit the clause, and to the disgraceful habit of cutting down the sacred text, probably attributable to haste in this instance (see further on, p. 170), on the part of the transcribers, or the editors, of the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts.

Then it must be borne in mind, that, while it is certain that our Lord did read those words, St. Luke, of all writers, inspired or uninspired, was the very last who would fail to

record them. It would be against the whole tenour of this Gospel, of which the special characteristic is the prominence given to all indications of deep sympathy, of utter tenderness and compassionateness, a characteristic which elicited from the great representative of cultivated scepticism the declaration that St. Luke's Gospel is "le plus beau livre qu'il y ait" (E. Renan, 'Les Evangiles,' p. 283).

I note this omission as one among many indications of untrustworthiness in the chief ancient authorities followed by the Revisers; the reader will judge how far it affects the character of the Revised Version.

It is not within my general scope to deal with points not directly connected with our Lord's personal history, but it is scarcely possible to pass over the extraordinary historical blunder which, in the margin of the Revised Version, is imputed to St. Mark (vi. 22). The Evangelist is made to say that the dancing girl, daughter of Herodias by her former husband, as Josephus tells us, and, as all critics agree, tells us truly, was the daughter of Herod the Tetrarch. On the absurdities involved in this statement, see the criticism of Dr. Scrivener in his 'Introduction.'

It affects, and that substantially, the character of ℵ, B, D, L, Δ, following some early transcriber, who, doubtless, in ignorance or carelessness, is responsible for this *plain and clear error.*

In Mark vii. 19, we find the reading *καθαρίζων*, *i.e.* in the rendering "*this he said* making all meats clean." I entirely agree with the Revisers as to the high probability of their reading. I had some years previously defended it in my note on the passage in the 'Speaker's Commentary.' But considering the number and the weight of the authorities adverse to the change of reading and of rendering, and the necessity, if it be adopted, of introducing a parenthesis, I

should certainly not have ventured to do more than give a marginal note.

Granted the improvement, can the change be defended *as necessary?*

(B.) THE PARABLES OF OUR LORD.

I am happy to observe that no changes of any importance are introduced by the Revisers into the reports of the parables in either of the Evangelists. Minor points I will not here dwell upon, but I will call attention to Matt. xiii. 35 to express my deep thankfulness — a feeling which I am sure will be shared by the immense majority of Christian readers—that the Revisers have rejected totally, leaving it without mention even in the margin, the reading *the prophet Isaiah;* especially because this is a corruption not only adopted by Tischendorf, but defended at considerable length in the Prolegomena to his edition of the 'Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum,' p. xxxiv. He assigns to it a foremost place among genuine readings attested by early authorities, but now extant in extremely few MSS., this being found only in ℵ, the Sinaitic MS., and in D.

There is no doubt as to its existence in the third century; it was quoted by Porphyrius as a proof of the gross ignorance of the Evangelist. Jerome, in the fifth century, says that it was expunged from the manuscripts which he himself used. Eusebius, on Ps. 78 tit., gives a very probable account of the origin of the blunder: "Some, not understanding that Asaph was the 'prophet' intended by Matt., added in his Gospel 'by Isaiah the prophet,' an addition which is not found in the most accurate MSS."

Westcott and Hort do not adopt this blunder in their own text, but insert it in their margin, and defend it in their appendix, p. 12 seq. Dr. Hort, in a separate note, says, "It is difficult not to think Ἡσαΐου genuine." That is, it is diffi-

cult to believe that the Evangelist was not guilty of gross ignorance or of unpardonable negligence. I cannot imagine what the writer of this note thought of the veracity, the biblical knowledge, not to speak of the inspiration, of the Apostle and Evangelist. Whether or not he recommended to the Revisers a similar course, as he might seem to have been bound to do in consistency with his own principles, it is clear that in this case the majority of the Committee shrank from imputing to St. Matthew a statement which would imply that the Evangelist was so little acquainted with the two books most frequently cited in the New Testament, viz. the Psalms and Isaiah, that he assigned a prediction, well known as Messianic, to the wrong author.

We gladly welcome this somewhat rare indication of caution.

Up to the close of our Lord's ministerial work in Galilee, no points seem to call for special attention, save the two following, which are of grave import in their bearings upon our Lord's teaching.

The first point is the total omission from the text of the Revised Version in St. Matthew's Gospel (xvii. 21) of the passage in which our Lord states that "this kind goeth not out save by prayer and fasting," and of the last words "and fasting" from St. Mark's Gospel (ix. 29).

In both cases the old reading is noticed in the margin; in St. Matthew, as resting on *many* authorities, *some* ancient; in St. Mark, as supported by *many ancient authorities.*

Before we inquire into the weight of authorities favouring, or adverse to, the innovation, we are entitled to ask whether, in face of the amount of authorities thus admitted to be opposed to it, the Revisers were justified in so serious a mutilation of our Lord's teaching, especially in reference to a question which has been long contested between Churchmen of different schools, and to a point which has been

defended with equal zeal and learning by some of the chief representatives of Anglican theology. The rejection implies that the word "fasting" is a *plain and clear error*, a sentence warmly applauded by the representatives of one school of religious thought, but inflicting a severe and powerful blow upon others. This last consideration would of course have no weight, supposing the evidence to be conclusive, but it certainly imposed upon the Revisers the duty of the utmost caution; they are bound to prove a *plain and clear error*, and that in face, as they admit, of *many ancient authorities*.

We now have to examine the authorities. What we find from Tischendorf's eighth edition is, that in St. Matthew the whole clause is omitted on the authority of ℵ*,* B, one cursive (33), the Sahidic Version, and the Memphitic (according to some MS. or MSS. ?).

Now the clause is given in full by all other uncials (eighteen are cited by Tischendorf himself), including those which, in doubtful cases, usually agree with B; all other cursives, all the best Versions, *sc.* Italic, Vulgate, Syriac, and, according to the best editions, the Memphitic; a complete phalanx of Fathers, even *Origen*, Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, and all later Greek expositors; so Tischendorf, to whom the *Quarterly* Reviewer, p. 357, adds Athanasius, Basil, Tertullian, and others.

Surely the Revisers must see that their marginal note, telling us that *some* of the authorities which support the old reading are ancient, is seriously misleading.

Tischendorf, whose opinion, as must be supposed, is adopted by the Revisers, regards it as an interpolation from St. Mark.

---

* I observe that the omission occurs in fol. 10 of ℵ; now this leaf is one of those which according to Tischendorf were written by the scribe of B; Dr. Hort (§ 288) accepts Tischendorf's statement We have thus the testimony of one scribe only. See further on (p. 234).

Two Evangelists, it seems, cannot agree in their report of our Lord's own words without exposing themselves to the attack of captious or unwary critics. If an assimilation had been shown on good grounds to be probable, the usual and natural course would have been to have looked for it in the second Gospel, certainly not in the first, which, above all things, is conspicuous for its full and accurate records of our Lord's words.

We turn, however, to the Gospel of St. Mark. There we find that the same two uncials, ℵ* and B, stand absolutely alone among all manuscripts—alone, that is, with one singularly weak exception, *k*, an inferior codex of early Italic. Without any shadow of support from Greek or Latin Fathers, they end the sentence with προσευχῇ.

Let the reader consider the varied and complete weight of the authorities adverse to this mutilation. Not to speak of a corrector of ℵ, they include the three ancient and independent MSS., A, C, and D, six uncials, for the most part satellites of B, all cursives, and all Versions.

The process by which this strange mutilation is effected calls for notice. First, St. Matthew's account is rejected as an interpolation from the second Gospel, so that the reader's apprehension as to the effect of the omission is somewhat relieved, whatever he may think of the arbitrary assumption; but then on turning to St. Mark he finds that the special words about which he felt anxious, or certainly interested, whether his prepossessions were in favour of the old or of the new reading, are expunged from the text.

Other innovations are undoubtedly of greater moment, as affecting vital doctrines; but in the entire range of biblical criticism I do not remember a more arbitrary or less defensible mutilation, affecting two Gospels, and an emphatic declaration of our Lord.

(c.) THE CLOSE OF OUR LORD'S WORK IN GALILEE.

Mark ix. 43–50.—We now come to an address to the disciples, of singular interest as marking, I may say as summarizing, our Saviour's special injunctions to the Twelve; of singular and emphatic solemnity, impressing upon them the highest characteristic of Christian ethics, an address recorded with peculiar fulness and vividness by St. Mark, doubtless in the exact form delivered to him by St. Peter, on whose spirit every word must have been impressed in characters of fire.*

(1) We miss the emphatic reiteration, to the importance and awful solemnity of which St. Augustine and other Fathers called special attention.

In this case it has peculiar importance as exemplifying a marked characteristic of our Lord's teaching, brought out most frequently and vividly in St. Mark's Gospel.

The margin tells us that *vv.* 44 and 46 are omitted by the "best ancient authorities."

That is ℵ, B, of course, supported, however, by C, and two of their usual followers, L and Δ, and four cursives only. But the verse stands in A, D (two perfectly independent witnesses), N, X, Γ, Π, in all nine good uncials, all other cursives, the best MSS. of early Italic, the Vulgate, Syriac, and Æthiopic. To these must be added the express and pointed testimony of Augustine, "non eum piguit uno loco eadem verba ter dicere," quoted by Tischendorf.

(2) We then miss a sentence, which, if I am not totally mistaken as to its meaning and bearing, gives a most practical and forcible point to the whole discourse, drawing out most distinctly the characteristic which above all others

* I venture to call attention to my own notes on this passage, Mark ix. 43–50, in the 'Speaker's Commentary.' See also Jablonski, ed. Te Water, tom. ii. pp. 458–485.

marks the true disciples of Christ. Our Lord has denounced in most awful terms the destiny of the impenitent, *every one* (*sc.* of those named in the preceding verse) *shall be salted with fire; and* (He then adds) *every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.* Thus we have two antitheses: (1) the condemned sinner, and the accepted sacrifice, the true-hearted disciple, whose body is *a living sacrifice* (Rom. xii. 1), whose prayers are spiritual sacrifices; (2) fire and salt—the fire of Gehenna, and the purifying, preserving, saving grace of the Gospel, of which the highest manifestation is perfect charity.

Such appears to me to be the true meaning of the rejected verse, but whether that, or any other exposition be adopted, we must not risk or tolerate a mutilation, unless we are constrained by irresistible evidence.*

For the omission stand ℵ, B, L, Δ, the recension which is specially conspicuous for omissions—proofs of purity according to some, indications of haste, or of fastidiousness, according to others—but certainly to be distrusted unless supported by other independent authorities.

The clause is found in nine good uncials—note the independence and character of these—A, C, D, N, X, Γ, Π—and all ancient Versions of weight.

But Tischendorf suggests that some transcriber or critic took the passage from Leviticus ii. 13; a conjecture at once arbitrary and irrational, one which savours of the characteristic bad taste and defective judgment of that critic, eminent as he is for other gifts, for unparalleled industry and tact as a decipherer and registrar of MSS. It is surely one which few, if any, English critics of character will venture to defend. The reader has but to note the direct connection with our

* For Dr. Hort's account of the matter, see his 'Introduction,' p. 101. It is of course ingenious and able, but equally remarkable for subtlety and boldness. I have occasion again to refer to this point in the section on 'Conflate Readings,' in Part III. p. 211.

Lord's words in the next verse: "*good is the salt, i.e.* with which the sacrifice is seasoned; *have that salt in yourselves,* and have *peace* one with another."

I can scarcely realize the feelings of any reader who, setting side by side the Revised Version with our own Authorized Version, can doubt which retains the very words of the Saviour. To my mind the statement of St. Mark stands out among the most striking instances of his vivid appreciation of "the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God."

SECTION VI.

From the Close of our Lord's Ministry in Galilee to His Arrival at Jerusalem.

In this portion of the Gospel narrative the most serious damage has been inflicted upon St. Luke, the Evangelist to whom we are indebted for the fullest and most deeply interesting record of our Lord's discourses and works during this period. St. Mark, however, has received some wounds of a peculiarly offensive and painful character.

Luke ix. 54, 55.—At the outset, immediately after the last discourse recorded by St. Mark and discussed in the preceding section, we have to call special attention to a most grievous mutilation. In Luke ix. 54, 55 we note, in the first place, the omission from the Revisers' Version and their Greek text of the strikingly characteristic appeal of the two Apostles of zeal and love, St. James and St. John, to the example of Elias, or, as the Revisers prefer, Elijah; * and then, secondly, we find to our utter bewilderment that the Revisers obliterate *from their text* one of the most heart-searching sayings of our Lord, a saying which was specially adapted to the new position which the disciples were henceforth to occupy, which at every critical period in the history of the Church has been most deeply impressed upon the hearts of Christians conscious of the danger of Judaistic

* If the Revisers intend to represent the Greek text they might surely retain the Greek form, with which every reader is familiar. I do not understand why they prefer the Hebrew form, which they cannot use consistently.

prejudice in any form, which on the other hand has been most flagrantly and disastrously neglected by leaders of hostile factions.

In the margin they tell us that "some ancient authorities add, *Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.* Some, but fewer, add also, *For the Son of Man came not to destroy men's souls but to save them.*"

Thus rejected from the text, relegated to the margin—in part with a notice indicating distrust of the authorities which, ancient as they are admitted to be, could not procure admission for these words into the Revised Text; in part with a still more distinct expression of adverse judgment—the whole of this most weighty, most precious declaration, so far as the Revisers' influence extends, is withdrawn from the sphere of Christian consciousness. Many preachers will refrain altogether from citing them as genuine; no preacher addressing a congregation of ordinary culture will henceforth be able to quote them without a previous statement, necessarily open to question, of the grounds on which he ventures to press them upon the attention of his hearers.

Had they been preserved but in a small number of early and trustworthy documents, their singular depth and power, their special accordance with the whole tenour of the third Gospel, ought surely to have saved them from such treatment, and justified their retention in the place which for ages they have occupied in the sacred text. But after all how stand the authorities?

The authorities which support them are far more ancient and, in such a matter, I venture to assert, far more trustworthy, than any extant manuscripts. The old Italic, the Syriac Version of Cureton, and the Peshito, occupying the highest place among ancient Versions, bear witness to their acceptance in the East and in the West before the third

century.* The Vulgate, the Coptic, Æthiopic, Gothic, and Armenian show they were received throughout all Christendom during and after the fourth century. These witnesses are supported by early Fathers of high authority, Ambrose, probably Clement Alex., Optatus, Didymus, Epiphanius, and Chrysostom.

Again, the old reading is found in eight uncials. Among these is D, the well-known Codex Bezæ, which has little weight in cases of interpolation attributable to carelessness or adoption of loose traditions, but when it is supported by the early Italic and early Fathers, unquestionably preserves important sayings of our Lord—a fact especially applicable in this case; while the other uncials are weighty either as independent witnesses, or as generally following the recension of which B is the chief representative. Also the great majority of cursives, Tischendorf says *alii permulti;* denoting a decided preponderance.

But on the other side the Revisers have a right to insist upon the array of MSS. of the greatest weight for antiquity, and especially important when supported by independent witnesses; as in this case ℵ, B are followed by L, Δ, Ξ, in conjunction with A, C, E, and five other uncials.

If, therefore, the Revisers had been commissioned or authorized to construct a revised Greek text, and if that text was simply to set before the student the readings of the oldest and best manuscripts, they would certainly have been justified in the course which, as we must be assured in this case, they have reluctantly adopted.

But if their first duty was to preserve intact all sayings of

---

* Tischendorf, who rejects the whole clause, makes an admission of which the importance can scarcely be estimated too highly. On *v.* 56 he says, "Secundo vero jam sæculo quin in codicibus omnis hæc interpolatio circumferri consueverit, pro testium auctoritate, Latinorum maxime et Syriacorum, dubitari nequit."

our Lord, attested on solid evidence to have been recorded in the Gospels; and to reject none attributed to Him, and generally received by Christians, unless they be proved to be *plain and clear error*, I do not see how they can be acquitted of "exorbitancy," or of what appears to me substantial violation of the conditions under which they were entrusted with the most important of all works.

In such a case special weight must surely be assigned to internal evidence. We must needs inquire which of possible alternatives is the more probable.

(*a*) Was such a saying as this at all likely to be invented? was it one which a bold unscrupulous forger would ever have thought of inventing? which he would have persuaded Christendom to accept as a genuine utterance of our Lord? Or, putting aside all imputations of conscious forgery, was it a saying likely to have had its origin in the spirit of some unknown teacher of the Church, so placed and so trusted as to take the position of an exponent of his Master's mind? Is that alternative, however stated, however modified, one which will commend itself to any well-informed and candid mind? Such a teacher must have combined most inconsistent qualities: he must have been at once audacious in invention, and at the same time penetrated with the very fulness of the spirit which breathes throughout the Gospel, and finds adequate expression most especially in this and similar sayings recorded by St. Luke, the Pauline Evangelist.

(*b*) On the other side we have an alternative which commends itself as completely free from such difficulties, and as supplying an adequate and satisfactory answer to the question of genuineness.

We ask, was there any strong reason which, after the early part of the third century, and especially in times and chief places of heated controversy, might induce persons in positions of considerable influence to shrink from the statement

as it stands before us, and to eliminate it, so far as might be in their power, from the field of discussion ?

Surely all can at least understand the feelings of those controversialists who stood out in opposition to Marcion, and to those early writers who went farthest in maintaining that the spirit which animated Elijah and the chief representatives of what was called Judaism, was not only diverse from, but diametrically opposed to, that which pervaded the utterances of our Lord, and which He inculcated as the distinctive characteristic of His true followers. What the maintainers of the true, Catholic, and Christian doctrine were especially anxious to uphold was the unity of the Spirit which, under all apparent diversities, pervaded the Prophets of old, whose zeal was specially represented by Elijah, and which ruled in all its fulness and depth the heart of St. John, the great exponent of Christian love. This text must have presented peculiar facilities to the skilful opponent, peculiar difficulties to the staunch defender, of that great fundamental principle. We are thankful to observe that it did not induce the soundest teachers of the Church to countenance or adopt this mutilation, though at some uncertain period it was introduced by persons sufficiently influential to mutilate the text currently—not universally but generally—found in MSS. of the fourth and following centuries. We cannot, moreover, but remark that the two most ancient MSS. in which the words are obliterated are conspicuous for omissions—a point which, notwithstanding Dr. Hort's disclaimer,* appears to me capable of absolute demonstration.

One thing is certain. We have to choose one of the two alternatives—wilful interpolation, or, whether careless or

* I have to meet this disclaimer further on ; here I will simply remark that Dr. Hort considers that what other critics regard as omissions are proofs of purity, of freedom from interpolation. Accepting them as the true reading, he cannot admit them to be omissions.

wilful, wanton deletion of this grand saying. I should not have thought it possible that a company of wise, learned, and devout men could have hesitated in their choice, much less that they should have deliberately expunged the words from their text.

To those who feel a conviction that they are the very words of Christ, carrying with them internal evidence of their authenticity, all other considerations are as dust in the balance.

Such a decision may give pain or offence to some well entitled to deference on matters not touching the faith, but it will give relief and comfort to myriads; and will at any rate go far towards liberating our minds from what I cannot but regard as a servile acquiescence in a critical system, which attaches exclusive importance to the text represented by the Eusebian, or Alexandrian, or—by whatever name it may ultimately be called—the recension which determined the text of the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts.

THE LORD'S PRAYER IN ST. LUKE.

Luke xi. 2–4.—Here we have to notice the alterations adopted by the Revisers in the Lord's Prayer as recorded by St. Luke, on a different occasion from that on which it is recorded by St. Matthew.

Three considerable clauses are omitted in the Revised Version, contrary, as the margin informs us, to "*many ancient authorities.*"

(1) The Revised Version has "Father" instead of "Our Father which art in heaven." This omission follows ℵ, B, against all other manuscripts, uncial and cursive (one MS., L, which generally agrees with B, has "Our Father"); also against all ancient Versions, except the Vulgate.

Origen refers to the clause three times in his treatise on

Prayer. In c. 18 (p. 227) he expressly distinguishes between the reading in Matthew and in Luke, and omits the words in question. In c. 22, he quotes "Father" only; but earlier in the same treatise, c. 15 (p. 222 c), he has "Our Father which art in heaven," referring, as the context there shows, to St. Luke's Gospel.

It may safely be inferred that Origen had the abbreviated form before him in some MS. or MSS., but his citation of the omitted words is best accounted for by assuming a different reading, which he recognized, though he might not prefer it.

(2) The omission of the other clauses, "Thy will be done on earth as in heaven," and "Deliver us from evil," rests precisely on the same authorities. In each case the preponderance of external authorities in favour of the clauses, so far as numbers go, is immense; no less than seventeen uncials are cited by Dr. Scrivener, who adds, "All cursives not named above (*i.e.* 1, 22, 57, 130, 131, 226$^{\text{x}}$, 237, 242, 426), the old Latin *b, c, f, ff, i, l, q*, whereof *f* mostly goes with the Vulgate (*hiant a, e*), the Memphitic, Peshito, Curetonian, Philoxenian Syriac, and the Æthiopic Versions" ('Introduction,' p. 468). Dr. Scrivener is inclined to dismiss the latter clause as an assimilation; but, as he observes, the internal evidence is in favour of retention.

I must here observe that one of the Revising Company accepts the omission of "deliver us from evil" mainly on the ground that it supplies a pretext for rejecting the last clause of the Prayer in St. Matthew's Gospel also as a gloss.

It is a perfectly legitimate proceeding to argue as to the probability of a shorter recension of the Prayer on the occasion which leads to its record in St. Luke, but to omit such clauses, *as plain and clear errors*, appears to me wholly unjustifiable. The utmost that the Revisers had the right to do was to give a notice in the margin that *some* ancient authorities omit them.

THE MISSION OF THE SEVENTY.

Luke x. 1–20.—In *v.* 1 a change of no importance in itself is suggested in the margin, which tells us that "many ancient authorities add *two*;" i.e. *seventy-two* instead of seventy. Westcott and Hort in their Greek text enclose the word *two* in brackets. The change, small as it is, is "interesting," as Dr. Scrivener remarks (see Introd. p. 474), "being one in which B (not ℵ) is at variance with the very express evidence of the earliest ecclesiastical writers." It is, therefore, of real importance in its bearing upon the value of the oldest manuscripts.

In this case B is supported by D, and early Western documents, Italic and Vulgate, agreeing, as is frequently the case, with the Syriac of Cureton; also by two uncials, M and R.

It is opposed by the best uncials, ℵ, A, C, independent witnesses, with seven others which generally side with B; also by the generality of cursives, and all other ancient Versions, including some MSS. of early Italic.

The early Fathers to whom Dr. Scrivener refers are Irenæus, Tertullian (in a passage which is remarkably explicit, c. Marc. iv. 24), Eusebius twice in the 'Demonstration,' once in the H. E., Basil, and Ambrose; all quoted by Tischendorf, who does not adopt this change.

In the marginal notices the word *many* is certainly too strong, if not misleading.

In *v.* 15, at the close of our Lord's address to the seventy missionaries, a change singular for its tone and character is adopted in the Revised Text in this place, without any indication of a different reading. It stands thus, "And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? Thou shalt be brought down unto Hades." This extraordinary reading is given in place of "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shall be brought down to Hell." Its

unsuitableness to the occasion on which it is first recorded, Matt. xi. 23, has been forcibly exposed by Sir Edmund Beckett. Here the context is at least equally opposed to the change. Capernaum had been raised to the place of the highest spiritual dignity by the presence of the Saviour, but by its coldness and impenitence it forfeited all claims to pre-eminence, and was abased to the condition of infidels.

For the new reading (which in the Greek substitutes μή for ἤ) stand ℵ, B, D, L, Ξ, the Syriac of Cureton, two MSS. of early Italic.

Against it A, C, with seven uncials, most of them usually siding with B, nearly all cursives, the Gothic, the Peshito and Philox. Syriac, and Augustine.

So far as the external authorities are concerned the balance is nearly equal.

The internal evidence appears to me decisive, and in favour of the old reading and rendering.

Luke x. 41, 42.—We have now to consider the singularly important account of a great saying of our Lord as recorded by St. Luke. The whole transaction is related by the Evangelist in terms so graphic and affecting that Renan, who on questions of æsthetic and historic tact is a good authority, says of it, "Aucune plume n'a laissé tomber dix lignes plus charmantes." See 'Les Evangiles,' p. 282. But in this beautiful narrative an innovation is suggested in the margin which affects the most solemn and infinitely the most important point—the great lesson which our Lord then inculcated upon Martha, and through her upon the hearts of all His followers liable to similar temptations.

After a most useless and vexatious suggestion in the margin that "a few ancient authorities" omit "anxious" (the word which the Revised Version substitutes for the more comprehensive word "careful") and "about many things," we find in the margin a far more serious innovation

commended by the words, "Many ancient authorities read 'but few things are needful or one.'" So that the *one thing needful*, that which designates the extreme spirituality of Mary's choice, directing the minds of anxious inquirers and supporting devout spirits, cannot henceforth be undoubtedly quoted as genuine by those who defer to the authority of the Revisers.

That *one thing is needful*,—would that the Revisers had borne it in mind,—could not be questioned, never has been questioned by any who live on our Saviour's words and take their place by the side of Mary.

The authorities which have so far influenced the Revisers that they give the new reading in the margin (going half-way to meet Westcott and Hort, who introduce it into their Greek text without any notice indicating distrust, or the existence of adverse evidence), are ℵ, B, C^2 (a late correction), and L, followed by the Coptic, Æthiopic, and a late Syriac Version. Also Origen, as cited in the Catena of Corderius, and Basil (but see below).

Against it are A, C^x, all other uncials, nearly all cursives, Italic (some good MSS.), Vulgate, and the best Syriac.

Of the Fathers we have Macarius, an early and good authority; Chrysostom, Augustine, and other Fathers. Basil varies—he quotes it as it stands in the old text once, p. 535—in another passage he adopts the new reading, but gives an exposition, which, though forced—in fact because forced—shows how strongly he felt that "the one thing needful" was the paramount consideration: ἑνὸς δὲ τοῦ σκοποῦ.

Matthew xix. 9.—Passing to the records of the earliest events on the way to Jerusalem, we have first to notice the extraordinary innovation in St. Matthew's account of the divorce questions (see Matt. xix. 9). The clause which states that he who marries a divorced woman committeth adultery, is marked as doubtful in the margin, which

tells us that the words "are omitted in some ancient authorities."

We ask in which? The answer is, in ℵ (*which in this case differs from* B), C^3, *i.e.* a late corrector of the old MS., L, S, and D, to which may be added the Syriac of Cureton and the Sahidic. Origen does not cite the words.

On the other side are B, already noticed, supported by eleven uncials, nearly all cursives, good MSS. of early Italic, the Vulgate, both the old Syriac Versions, the Coptic, in good editions, the Æthiopic, and Armenian, with Basil.

Tischendorf rejects the clause as a case of assimilation, and this view doubtless had weight with the Revisers. Westcott and Hort, however, attached, as we may assume, special importance to the authority of D, who, because he is well known as an interpolator, is to be received as a witness entitled in their judgment to be heard in preference even to B, their all but infallible guide.

So that St. Matthew, the special recorder of our Lord's sayings, is to be noted as giving on this formal occasion an incomplete account of His decision, on a point of *legislative* importance.

THE YOUNG RULER.

In the account of this transaction, St. Mark x. 17–22 undergoes one mutilation. The words *take up thy cross* (ἄρας τὸν σταυρόν) are omitted altogether without marginal notice.

The authorities for omission are ℵ, B, C, D, Δ, one cursive, some MSS. of Italic, the Vulgate, two editions of the Coptic, and three Latin Fathers, Ambrose, Augustine, and Hilary.

For its retention stand A with eight uncials, most cursives, the Peshito, Coptic, Gothic, Armenian, and Æthiopic.

The testimony of Irenæus is explicit; we have both the Greek and the Latin interpretation, quoted by Tischendorf. In a case like this the authority of Irenæus outweighs any

single witness; nay, any combination of witnesses, unless they are sustained by strong internal evidence.

In my own note on this passage I recorded the omission of the words in the two oldest MSS. I did not then feel the distrust in their authority which a closer examination of their readings in important passages has since generated and confirmed.

Will any one maintain that these words are to be rejected as *a plain and clear error?*

But we turn to the account of this transaction in St. Matthew's Gospel, xix. 16, 17.

Here we encounter a most perplexing alteration, one which totally changes the import of the young ruler's question, and of our Lord's answer.

First, the word *good* before *Master* is omitted; the young ruler does not there use a word, natural on his lips, but calling for correction, as applied without adequate appreciation of its force. And then the words put into our Lord's mouth are "Why dost thou ask me concerning that which is good?" Then we read, "One there is that is good,"—omitting the words following.

In the first place (1) this reading directly contradicts the record given by St. Mark and St. Luke. If this is a true account, those two very distinct and concurrent accounts are a grave misrepresentation. (2) Secondly the reading obliterates a saying of deep and solemn import; one which was liable to be misunderstood and certain to be misused, suggesting therefore to some bold innovator the expediency of a change which would remove that difficulty. (3) Thirdly the new reading implies that the young ruler intended to put a question, savouring of the schools, as to the meaning of the abstract term τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ.

What are the authorities preferred to some which are admitted in the margin to be *ancient?*

(1) For the omission of *ἀγαθέ*, ℵ, B, D, L, 1, 22; Æthiopic and Origen, tom. iii. 664 seq.

For retaining it, all other uncials, beginning with C (A unfortunately *hiat*), all other cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac, the Sahidic and Coptic, and the Armenian Versions. To this must be added the express testimony of Justin Martyr, of Irenæus (i. 26. 2), of Hilary, and of Basil.

(2) For the transformation of our Lord's own words, the same uncials, ℵ, B, D, L, supported by *a, b, c, e, ff*, the Syriac of Cureton, the Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic, and Origen. Against it eleven uncials, nearly all cursives; the Peshito and Sahidic Versions, Justin and Irenæus, Chrysostom and his followers.

The reading therefore is ancient, at first finding place in Western texts, remarkable for what Reiche calls *socordia* and *licentia;* then adopted, as it would seem, by Origen, and retained in later Alexandrian recensions.

We have, as can scarcely be doubted, a reading partly indicating doctrinal bias or scrupulousness, but resting chiefly on Alexandrian subtlety.

THE PARABLES RECORDED BY ST. LUKE.

This very important and peculiarly interesting portion of Scripture appears to have been left untouched so far as regards essential points.

I must however observe that in the parable of the prodigal son one touch of exceeding tenderness and beauty is lost, not, I am happy to say, in the text, but in the marginal reading, Luke xv. 21. What St. Luke makes us feel is that as the son, held in his father's loving arms, could not choose but utter the words of penitential humility, *I am no more worthy to be called thy son;* so neither could he at that moment add the words which were perfectly adapted to his state of

feelings when first awakened to a sense of unpardonable guilt, and far from his father's house, but were utterly incompatible with his actual position. To have then asked to be made as one of his father's hirelings would have been impossible, an ungracious mockery.* Yet these words are added in ℵ, B, D, U, X, and in several MSS. of the Vulgate. Westcott and Hort retain them, but bracketed, in their text. It is to be deeply regretted that they should appear in the margin of the Revised Version. Considering that they have two indications of spuriousness, first as a palpable *assimilation* to *v.* 19, and next as finding place in the MS. most notorious for interpolations, we might surely have expected that these two critics would have held to their own canons, and rejected the words altogether.

And now, omitting to notice a considerable number of slight, and certainly very unnecessary, alterations in St. Mark and St. Luke, I pass on to the history of the Last Week.

---

* See a striking exposition of this passage in the fragments of Clem. Alex. p. 1017 seq. ed. Potter.

SECTION VII.

The Words and Acts of our Lord on His Entrance into, and during His last Visit to, Jerusalem.

Matt. xxi.–xxv.; *Mark* xi. 1–10; *Luke* xix. 29–49.—In this section the first change of importance occurs at the outset—in St. Mark's account of our Lord's advance from Bethany.

It touches an event especially interesting in its bearings upon our Lord's Personality, the fulfilment of prophecy, and the characteristics of the Messianic kingdom.

Our Lord sent two of His disciples, before He left Bethany, giving them instructions concerning the ass—one which St. Mark, followed by St. Luke, is careful to record, had never borne a rider—which He was now to ride, like kings and judges in olden times, intimating at once His dignity, and His special character as Prince of Peace.

What our Lord told them to say to the owner of the beast, should their right to take the ass be questioned, was simply, "The Lord hath need of it," or as St. Matthew, referring to the colt, says, "of them."

What He added, as St. Matthew and St. Mark tell us—undoubtedly for the sake of the disciples themselves, to remove any apprehension they might feel as to the result of their mission—was, "*and straightway* he will send it," as St. Mark adds "hither."

So stands the account in our Authorized Version. It enables us to realize the feelings of the disciples, the calm

exercise of unquestionable authority by our Lord, the combination of condescension to their weakness with His own clear determination to fulfil all that was essential to the manifestation of His kingdom. The one word *hither*, added by St. Mark, accords with the style of that Evangelist, ever careful to note minute circumstances which add to the vividness of his narrative.

But in the text of the Revised Version St. Mark is made to give an account of that injunction which totally alters its character.

We read there, to our bewilderment, that our Lord added words with a view of reassuring the owners of the beast.

The answer stands thus: *Say ye, the Lord hath need of them; and straightway he will send them back hither;* the word "back" in the margin being further explained to mean *back again.*

We are struck first by the absolute contradiction to St. Matthew's clear and simple account. There the Revisers leave the words *and straightway he will send them* untouched. I do not suppose that any doubt was ever felt as to their meaning there. In the next place the altered reading introduces a point inconceivably mean and unsuitable. Our Lord is actually represented as bidding the disciples assure the owners of the beast that He would send it back again directly. The mischief is effected by the insertion of one word, *πάλιν, again,* interpreted as meaning "back again."

This interpolation, as I do not hesitate to call it, rests on the authority of six uncials, of course ℵ, B, followed by L, Δ, and supported by D and C^{x}, with variations, however, noticed by Tischendorf, which materially affect their evidence.

Against it are nine uncials, nearly all cursives (Tischendorf says *al. pl.,* but he cites *none* on the other side), all Versions,

early Italic and Vulgate, Sahidic, Memphitic, Syriac, Gothic, Armenian, and Æthiopic.*

Such a consensus of Versions, scarcely ever found in passages open to dispute, especially where the Eusebian or Origenistic recension is concerned, is absolutely conclusive, if not as to the true reading, yet as to the rejection of the innovation in all quarters of Christendom.

Will Convocation accept the responsibility for this grave innovation?

Mark xi. 8.—On the way to Jerusalem, in St. Mark's description, we meet with an innovation, which, if not important as regards our Lord's Personality, is of considerable importance as regards the good sense and accuracy of the Evangelist. The Revised Version tells us that many spread on His way "branches," which they had cut from "the fields," but the margin further tells us that the Greek, rendered "branches," means *layers of leaves*, a statement scarcely intelligible.† The text of the Authorized Version has a clear and simple statement, exactly in accordance with St. Matthew *in sense*, but not *in form*, thus showing that there is no ground for assuming a process of assimilation, viz. *others cut down branches of trees, and strawed them in the way.*

This innovation involves the change of *fields* for *trees*, and the omission of the last clause.

The MS. authority for the change is doubtful. ℵ, B, (C,) L, Δ, not without variations, have *ἀγρῶν* for *δένδρων*. So too Origen, iv. pp. 181, 193. The Versions which adopt that reading do not omit the last clause, viz. the Sahidic and Memphitic.

The Authorized Version has for it eight uncials, *all* cur-

* The testimony of Origen is doubtful. In tom. iv. p. 181 he omits *πάλιν*, but inserts it twice or thrice in tom. iii. We have here one instance among many of carelessness in that great critic or in his transcribers.

† The "Two Revisers," p. 51, seem to explain it as meaning "beds."

sives, as Tischendorf admits (*al. om.* [vid]), and all other ancient Versions.

As for the internal probabilities, I would ask whether *layers of leaves, i.e.* leaves made up into matting, are ever spoken of in connection with a solemn procession; whether, on the other hand, branches of trees, especially the palm, are not invariably accompaniments of such a triumphant march?

Mark xi. 26.—In this chapter (Mark xi.) the 26th verse, "But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive you your trespasses," is omitted altogether from the Revised Text, although the margin allows that it is supported by *many* ancient authorities.

The first remark which presents itself is that here we have a conspicuous instance of the insensibility of the ancient and modern innovators to what I have more than once noted as our Lord's habit of emphatic iteration—a habit especially illustrated in St. Mark's account of His discourses.

The question then comes, what are the authorities for or against the innovation?

For it we find the usual group, ℵ, B, L, with S, Δ. Against it all other uncials—thirteen are cited by Tischendorf—of various and independent recensions, nearly all cursives, the Italic, Vulgate, Gothic, Æthiopic, and Armenian Versions.

Is this saying to be rejected as a plain and clear error?

I will not here dwell on points of minor importance. Changes in the accounts of our Lord's proceedings at Jerusalem given by the Evangelist are sufficiently numerous and for the most part, as I venture to think, unnecessary.

With one change, however, I agree, although the authority of ancient manuscripts and Versions is far from decisive. In Mark xiii. 14, the name of the prophet Daniel is omitted in the text of the Revised Version, and is not noticed in the margin. As I pointed out in my note on the passage, the omission is sanctioned by the best commentators. It is of

importance as illustrating, in fact confirming, my statement in reference to the reading in Mark i. 2, that St. Mark does not cite the name of a prophet without absolute necessity. On that ground the Revisers, as I said, do well to omit *Daniel* here; had they omitted *Isaiah* there, they would not have imputed an inexcusable blunder to the Evangelist.

THE LAST SUPPER.

We are now come to the most solemn, most vital points in the whole Gospel; and have first to inquire whether any serious innovations are suggested or adopted in the accounts of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist.

In St. Matthew, xxvi. 26–29, two changes are without importance; the article is omitted before ἄρτον in *v.* 26, and ἐδίδου καί is changed to δούς, noticeable only as an instance of what Reiche calls errors originating "a male sedulis grammaticis." The most serious change is the omission of *new* (καινῆς) before *covenant*. For this omission the authorities are, as usual, ℵ, B, L, with Z; against it nine uncials, nearly all cursives (Tischendorf says *fere omnes*), the Italic, Vulgate, Coptic, Armenian, and Æthiopic Versions, and those Fathers whose testimony is most weighty, even in the Revisers' estimation, Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, and Chrysostom.

In St. Mark xiv. φάγετε is omitted in *v.* 22, but on good authority; and in *v.* 24 περί is changed to ὑπέρ.

But when we turn to St. Luke's Gospel, c. xxii., we observe, with equal surprise and grief, that a mutilation is suggested which for extent and importance has few parallels in the history of destructive criticism.

It must be borne in mind that a very special interest attaches to the account of the Last Supper which is given by St. Luke. No one doubts that the Evangelist received his information from St. Paul; in this point, if in any, we look

for characteristics of the Pauline Evangelist; but St. Paul tells us expressly, in words ever present to the minds of Christians—most especially when they listen to the prayer of Consecration, in which our own Church gathers up the scriptural intimation of the facts and of their meaning—that he received his account directly from the Lord. (See note on 1 Cor. xi. 23.) Here, if anywhere, we should expect to find, as we always have found, the most perfect agreement between the Evangelist and the Apostle.

But on looking at the margin of the Revised Version we read "some ancient authorities omit *which is given for you . . . which is poured out for you.*"

Will Convocation dare to make itself responsible for this note? Can it be doubted that it utterly discredits St. Luke's account?

Westcott and Hort in their text enclose the words in double brackets, indicating total distrust.

We turn to the ancient authorities, of course expecting to find at the head of them ℵ and B; but no—here those uncials and all other MSS. but *one* have the words, with slight variations. They are supported by Eusebius and Origen.

For the omission, D, with some copies of early Latin Versions, is the authority followed by the marginists. That manuscript, notorious for carelessness and caprice, gives a garbled and very confused account of the institution of that great sacrament; but it is scarcely conceivable that it would be allowed to cast a dark shade on the minds of readers trusting to the authority of the Revisers.

GETHSEMANE.

Throughout this last portion of the sacred narrative the deepest feelings of Christians are elicited; every detail is examined with an interest more intense than attaches to any

events in the world's history; observations which apply with special force to what is recognized by all as the last preparatory act for the Cross, that which bears as its special designation the Saviour's "*agony and bloody sweat.*"

The account of St. Matthew is left without substantial alteration. Still it would seem that it could not be left untouched. In c. xxvi. 42 three words are omitted from the Revised Text without notice, *sc. cup* (ποτήριον) and *from me* (ἀπ' ἐμοῦ). So far as manuscript authority is concerned, it may be admitted that, supposing a new text were contemplated, the innovators might claim a preponderance in favour of omitting the former word; for ℵ, B are supported by A and C, with three later uncials, and three cursives, 1, 33, and 102. We must, however, observe that they neglect the testimony of eleven uncials, weighty in their combination; of all other cursives; and no small number of ancient Versions, the best MS. of old Italic, the Vulgate, Coptic, and one edition of the Syriac—sufficient to justify retention of all the words, certainly to demand notice. When we add to this (1) our Saviour's habit of emphatic reiteration, to which attention has been repeatedly called, a habit specially exemplified on this solemn occasion, and (2) St. Matthew's distinct statement that He used the same word on the third occasion, there seems to me little room to doubt that the omission is another instance of unseemly haste in the action of an early transcriber, or of fastidiousness in some early critic.

Surely no one will maintain that the words in the Authorized Version are a *plain and clear error;* surely the Revisers must have yielded with reluctance to their own very peculiar views of *necessity!*

In St. Mark, ch. xiv., the few changes that are made do not materially affect the sense. In *v.* 35 the revised Greek text has ἔπιπτεν for ἔπεσεν; a change unobservable in the English

rendering; and in *v.* 40 *βεβαρημένοι* is changed to *καταβαρυνόμενοι*: I should have thought that the aorist in the one case, and the perfect in the other were obviously more appropriate; but in the former case the Revisers follow ℵ, B, L against all other uncials, some, A, C, weighty in themselves, and still more weighty in combination, with all known cursives, as Tischendorf admits. St. Mark of all Evangelists was least likely to substitute the imperfect tense, of very questionable significance, for the simple, graphic, vivid aorist. For the other change good manuscript authority is adduced: but surely, not sufficient to justify an innovation. Yet, as it would seem, the fact that St. Mark agrees with St. Matthew in stating that the disciples were already heavy with grief, as they had now been watching for some time, is to be taken as a proof that we have a case of assimilation, and as a reason that we are now to understand that at the close of the whole solemn transaction they were beginning to be borne down by sleep. It is however fortunate that this new shade of meaning does not come out in the rendering, "for their eyes were very heavy," which differs from the Authorized Version only by the proper introduction of the adverb "very."

But these and other points are lost sight of when we turn to St. Luke's Gospel, c. xxii., and find that the margin tells us that "many ancient authorities omit verses 43, 44," that is, the whole passage which records the appearance of the angel strengthening our Lord in His bodily weakness, and the great drops as of blood testifying to the intensity of the agony. We turn to the Greek text of Westcott and Hort and find that these two critics enclose the verses in double brackets, indicating untrustworthiness.

Now it is true that manuscripts of the recension with which we have chiefly to deal do omit the words, viz. ℵ^{a}—*i.e.* as corrected by a critical reviser, the so-called diorthota,—and

B, supported by ℵ and T, and I grieve to add by A, and a few cursives: and also that the omission is noticed, though not approved, by Hilary, an early and good authority.

On the other side is marshalled a goodly array of uncials and cursives of different recensions, and of the greatest weight in their combination: not to speak of early Versions which are nearly unanimous in supporting the old reading. We will consider the patristic evidence immediately; but before we go farther I venture to assert that the omission, to whatever cause it is to be attributed, seriously affects the authority of the critics who adopt the reading.

But I ask whether the omission did not originate in a doctrinal bias? We have at once the answer. Epiphanius tells us, not as a matter of probable conjecture, but distinctly and positively as a well-known undisputed fact, that "orthodox churchmen took away, removed from the text, the words, fearful of misapplication and not understanding their bearing." The words are singularly clear: *ὀρθόδοξοι ἀφείλοντο τὸ ῥηθέν, φοβηθέντες καὶ μὴ νοήσαντες αὐτοῦ τὸ τέλος* ('Anchor.' § 31). The reasons which Epiphanius assigns are striking. Fear, at once the weakest and most rash of all motives; and a want of spiritual discernment, common as would seem in modern as well as early ages. Epiphanius moreover tells us that the passage is extant in the Gospel of St. Luke in the unrevised copies (*ἐν τοῖς ἀδιορθώτοις ἀντιγράφοις*). He also mentions the important fact that it was cited by Irenæus.

There is not in the whole Gospel a clearer case of an alteration invented, not, I am thankful to say, by the early Church, but by certain critics or revisers claiming the name of orthodox. What they feared was that this passage might give a pretext for those who seized eagerly on every indication of human infirmity in our Saviour. But as for the best Fathers there is no reason to suppose that they made them-

selves accomplices in the mutilation. Tischendorf indeed notices the silence of St. Athanasius on two occasions; * but that great teacher always confines himself to the subject in hand, and never notices collateral passages or statements which do not bear directly upon his argument, which throughout the Arian controversy was to prove the divinity of our Lord. The proofs of the humanity were distinctly recognized by him, but there was no occasion for referring to them in the treatise in question. It is true that Cyril of Alexandria passes over this passage in his commentary on St. Luke; but among all theologians whose authority has any weight in the Church, Cyril was remarkable for the tendency which soon after his time issued in the monophysite heresy. He would certainly sympathize with the "orthodox" corrupters of the text; but he is too prudent to give direct countenance to their daring innovation.

On the other hand, supporting the whole passage we have an array of authorities which, whether we regard their antiquity or their character for sound judgment, veracity, and accuracy, are scarcely paralleled on any occasion. We have first Justin Martyr, bearing witness to the faith of the Church in Palestine, in Asia Minor, and in Rome, the very earliest of the Fathers subsequent to the Apostolic age. We have then Irenæus, a Father who comes nearest to Justin in point of time, who in all questions of authenticity stands foremost among the Fathers, attesting the universal faith of Christendom. His testimony is more especially valuable, since it is given not in a mere passing notice, but in a careful enumeration of the scriptural proofs of our Lord's true and perfect

* This is a striking instance of the danger of negative assertions. Tischendorf naturally trusted to the indices of scriptural quotations, and evidently was not aware that on another occasion, where the passage bore upon his argument, Athanasius cites its contents. See note, p. 43. On neither of the two occasions to which Tischendorf alludes (pp. 456, 709) is there any reference to St. Luke's Gospel.

humanity (in lib. iii. xxii. 92 p. 543 ed. Stieren); as Epiphanius remarks "arguing against the Docetæ."

We have these absolute proofs of the existence, and of the general reception, of the passage, both by Catholics and by heretics—against whom certainly Irenæus would not have cited a contested authority—some two hundred years before the amended, *i.e.* mutilated, documents which reject it from their texts.

To these oldest and highest authorities we may add a catena of the most illustrious Fathers from the third to the fifth centuries—of the Greeks, Hippolytus, Eusebius, Athanasius,* Dionysius and Didymus of Alexandria, and Chrysostom; of the Latins, Hilary, Jerome, and Augustine.

We are thankful to add that this text, so especially dear and precious to Christian hearts, soon recovered its position even in those parts of Christendom where the Alexandrian or Eusebian recension had for a season preponderating influence. Uncials which in doubtful cases usually support B are here against it; even ℵ*, *i.e.* the Codex Sinaiticus, but corrected by a contemporary reviser, with L, in most readings little more than a transcript of B, with D, *i.e.* early Western, F, G, H, K, M, Q, U (with asterisks, which prove that the transcriber was fully aware of the so-called correction); and E, S, V, Δ, Π—E ranking first among what Scrivener calls secondary uncials, and the two last satellites of B; lastly the reading is supported by all the best ancient Versions, including even the Coptic, the faithful witness to the best Alexandrian recension.

---

* Tom. iii. p. 1121, *ἐξ οἰκείου προσώπου ὁ Χριστὸς οἰκονομικῶς ἑκουσίως προσεύχεται μετὰ κραυγῆς, μετὰ δακρύων, μετὰ ἱδρώτων καὶ θρόμβου αἵματος, μετὰ ἀγγέλου ἐνισχύοντος καὶ οἱονεὶ παρακαλοῦντος αὐτόν, καίπερ υἱὸς θεοῦ ἀληθῶς ὑπάρχων.* I quote this passage, partly because it is overlooked in the Benedictine index, and by critical editors, even by Tregelles, but chiefly because it presents in a most striking and complete form the doctrine of the Church touching our Lord's humanity. It occurs in the 'Exposition of the lxviiith Psalm,' *v.* 17.

Whether the omission originated with Marcion is purely matter of conjecture. The suggestion occurs naturally, as in accordance with his system; but there is no sufficient reason to impute it even to him, as Tischendorf justly observes, "tacentibus Tertulliano et Epiphanio."

The history of the innovation is simple and perfectly intelligible. Up to the fourth century the text of St. Luke, ἀδιορθωτός, without correction, was received without question. It was appealed to, as decisive, in controversy with Docetæ of various shades; none of whom dared to meet it by denying its authenticity. When Arius, or some of his subtle followers, misused it, unscrupulous, over-timid, and at the same time over-bold, controversialists dared to expunge it from the text, at a time and place when their influence was uncontested. But ere long the unanimous evidence of the best and earliest Fathers, of ancient Versions, Western and Eastern, and doubtless also of independent, uncontaminated MSS., all in accordance with the deepest spiritual instincts of Christians, prevailed; the passage was restored to its true position, never again to be questioned, or subjected to captious objections, until in this nineteenth century a book which ought to represent in great measure the deliberate judgment of the Church of England presents it with a comment, which will henceforth make it impossible for theologians or preachers who accept the Revised Version to quote it as authority for a fundamental doctrine, or as a subject especially fitted for devout contemplation.

I ask again, will Convocation dare to take upon itself this responsibility?

THE FIRST WORD ON THE CROSS.

We have not even yet reached the climax. In the preceding section we had to fasten attention upon the most touching fact recorded in St. Luke's account of our Lord's

agony in Gethsemane, but marked for omission by the Revisers. Here we have to deal with a still more serious omission, not of the Evangelist's narrative of events, but of our Lord's own words, and not of ordinary words, but of the very first spoken by Him on the Cross; words which in all ages, by all students of the Bible, from the most devout and thoughtful believer to the most sceptical of rationalists, have ever been recognized as the very highest expression of the grace, wisdom, and love of the Saviour; words which stand foremost among those which have won for St. Luke the special honour due to the recorder of the tenderest and most loving characteristics of our Lord's Personality.

In the text of the Revised Version we still read in c. xxiii. 34, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do;" but in the margin stand the words, warning us not to accept them as genuine, "Some ancient authorities omit them;" and when we turn to the Greek text of Westcott and Hort we find them enclosed in double brackets, implying distrust.

What is the first thought which occurs to the critical reader? Is it not, Here we have a crucial test by which we may ascertain what ancient authorities are unsafe guides? How many are there? To what school do they seem to belong? How are they supported?

Here they are, as Tischendorf presents them in his last edition: "$\aleph^a$ (uncis inclusit), B, D^x, 38, 435, *a*, *b*, *d*, sah. cop.^{dz}." That is, *one* uncial only without indication of doubt; two cursives only; three MSS. of early Italic—sufficient however to show at how early a date the carelessness of copyists notorious for "*socordia* and *licentia*" committed the error—the Sahidic, and one edition of the Coptic.

In a case where the internal evidence is absolutely conclusive; where we can scarcely believe that the spirit of the critics, who marked the words as doubtful, sanctioned the conclusion to which they were driven by their system, it is

scarcely necessary to dwell on external evidence, but it is important, because it vindicates from the disgrace of countenancing the mutilation authorities to which we attach great value on other grounds. Here I give them again from Tischendorf: $\aleph^{\text{x.c}}$ (*sc.* the original text and a corrector of later date), A, C, D^{gr} (*i.e.* so in D in the more important Greek text), L (the usual satellite of B), Q (one of the very earliest MSS.), X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π ("sed E asteriscum præpositum habet"—a note to be regretted in the case of so good a MS.), *al. longe plur.* (*i.e.* by far the greatest number of cursives), *e*, *e*, *f*, *ff* (showing that the early Italic copyists are not all guilty of the same unpardonable *socordia*), vg. cop. $^{\text{wi al petr}}$ dz. rec. (cop. $^{\text{schw}}$ uncis inclusum habet), to which I add the edition of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge edited by Tattam, commended by Stein as *werthvolle Ausgabe*, syr.^{cu} (*i.e.* the most important ancient Versions in perfect unanimity), arm. æth.

I have quoted this array for its fulness; but that every reader may perceive its full significance I ask him to notice these facts. 1st. Among ancient manuscripts B, the Codex Vaticanus, in the estimation of Westcott and Hort the purest and infinitely the most important, stands alone, as presenting the mutilated text without notice of omission.

2nd. Taking the entire body of ancient Versions we find only a small number of early Italic—contradicted by others, and after due consideration rejected by Jerome—to which must be added the Sahidic, indicating the omission in an early Egyptian recension, supporting B.

3rd. That even the Codex Sinaiticus contained the words in its original text, and that although they were marked as doubtful by an early corrector, the marks of suspicion were removed by a subsequent one.

4th. That the evidence comes from every quarter of Chris-

tendom, from the East, Palestine and Syria, and probably Asia Minor; from the West, represented by the Vulgate, and the Greek text of Codex Bezæ; and from Egypt, as represented by MSS. second only to B in antiquity, and some of them by a short interval, and by the native and derived Versions.

We turn however to authorities which for certainty of antiquity and for explicitness and value of testimony stand in the foremost rank of trustworthy witnesses. First we take those quoted by Tischendorf, and therefore distinctly brought before the minds of all the Revisers. Irenæus is first quoted—a few words, but conclusive; I will however give the whole passage as peculiarly valuable in its bearings upon the character of this first of all authorities in questions of genuineness. It occurs in the third book, c. 18 § 5 (p. 247 ed. Grabe, p. 210 ed. Mass., p. 521 ed. Stieren): "Ad tantam temeritatem progressi sunt quidam, ut etiam martyres spernant et vituperent eos, qui propter Domini confessionem occiduntur, et sustinent omnia a Domino prædicta, et secundum hoc conantur vestigia passionis Domini, passibilis martyres facti (*i.e.* witnesses of the suffering Christ); quos et concedimus ipsis martyribus (see Grabe's note—whom we hand over to the martyrs as Christ's assertors on the day of judgment). Et ex hoc autem quod Dominus in cruce dixerit: *Pater, remitte eis, non enim sciunt quod faciunt;* longanimitas et patientia et misericordia et bonitas Christi ostenditur, ut et ipse pateretur, et ipse excusaret eos, qui se male tractassent. Verbum autem Dei quod nobis dixit: *Diligite inimicos vestros et orate pro eis qui vos oderunt:* Ipse hoc fecit in cruce, in tantum diligens humanum genus, ut etiam pro his, qui se interficerent, postularet."

It must be borne in mind that if this testimony stood absolutely alone it would be sufficient to prove that the words were received without question alike by heretics and Catho-

lics in Asia Minor, where Irenæus passed his youth under the teaching of Polycarp; in Gaul, where he lived as Presbyter and Bishop of Lyons; and at Rome, where he passed some time as an honoured ambassador and upholder of the faith.

But far from standing alone, we find Irenæus supported by a witness, to whose evidence the Revisers, and their predecessors Griesbach and Lachmann, are disposed to accord special value. Origen, in the second homily on Leviticus, tom. ii. p. 188, speaks explicitly, and in connection with a point to which he attaches great importance. He is speaking of sins of ignorance, sins committed without knowledge of their character and extent, for which Origen holds the High Priest, himself a teacher, could not plead that excuse, but of which he concludes from Lev. iv. 5 the whole synagogue could be guilty, and adds emphatically, "Quod et Dominus confirmat in Evangeliis cum dicit: *Pater, remitte illis, non enim sciunt quod faciunt.*"

To these Tischendorf adds the Apostolic Constitutions—quoting first a book which is admitted to be of the second or third century, ii. 16. 8, and then lib. v. 14. 8, in both passages ὅ for τί—Eusebius, who places the words in Canon x. as found in Luke only, and of course Chrysostom repeatedly, Hilary, Theodoret, and Damascenus. Special weight is also to be given to the passage in which Hegesippus puts the words into the mouth of St. James, the Lord's brother, at his martyrdom.

To this long list, additions important for their number, separate weight, and mutual independence, are given by the *Quarterly* Reviewer, Oct. 1881, p. 354, including Athanasius,*

* The reference to St. Athanasius is the more important inasmuch as it is not noticed in the Benedictine index. The passage is distinct, and exceedingly interesting, on Ps. lxviii. 14. Athanasius says that the Evangelist represents our Lord καὶ παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ ὑπὲρ τῶν σταυρούντων εὐχόμενον. See Ed. Ben. p. 1120.

Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and a complete catena of Greek Fathers to the ninth century; also Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine more than sixty times.

I believe no modern editor had previously dared to omit these precious words, or to mark them as doubtful. Tischendorf and Tregelles receive them with full acquiescence. That it should be reserved to two learned, sound, and conscientious English critics, slaves to their own arbitrary rules,* to affix to such words a stigma, and that their influence should have so far availed as to induce the Revisers to give it a place in their book, is a fact which rouses the deepest feelings of regret and astonishment.

Will Convocation dare to share the responsibility?

THE DARKENING OF THE SUN.

Luke xxiii. 45.—After this it is but a minor, though in itself a serious matter, that the Revised Version should make St. Luke relate a physical impossibility—an eclipse of the sun at the full moon.

This is, however, somewhat disguised in the English rendering, which gives us *the sun's light failing*, a phrase which, perplexing as it is to the English reader, might leave him unconscious of the meaning, even with the marginal comment, Gr. *the sun failing*, but which in the Greek, which is rendered thus oddly, is without any ambiguity, "*the sun undergoing an eclipse.*"

This is effected by substituting τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος for ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος.

Observe also that the Revised Version goes somewhat

* The neglect of internal evidence in this and similar passages is as characteristic of the writer of the 'Introduction to Westcott and Hort's New Testament' as his subservience to the external authorities which are recognized by both critics as all-sufficient.

further than Westcott and Hort. They give the other reading in their margin. The Revised Version implies that it is the true and only Greek reading.

For the alteration the responsibility lies with ℵ, B, and L (C is marked by Tischendorf as doubtful), and some few cursives, against all other MSS., nine uncial, nearly all cursives, the best Italic MSS., the Vulgate, the Syriac of Cureton, and others, followed by Tregelles.

The evidence of Origen is doubtful. On the side of the innovation we have explicit statements (tom. i. pp. 414, 415) quoted by Tischendorf. Against it we have no less positive and distinct repudiation; he says (tom. iii. p. 923), "Dicemus ergo Mt. et Mc. non dixerint defectionem solis tunc factam fuisse: sed neque Lucas secundum pleraque exemplaria, habentia sic—*et obscuratus est sol*," and he states his opinion either that it was changed by an officious scribe or by an enemy.

For the inconsistency of these statements no better reason can be given than the active and unsettled mind of the greatest and most subtle, but certainly not the most judicious, of early expositors.

For us the real question is this. Did St. Luke, as Sir Edmund Beckett observes the most highly educated of the Evangelists, commit a blunder so gross as to draw upon himself and his Gospel the derision of the heathen; or is it to be attributed to the rashness and ignorance of an early scribe, at once anxious and proud to give what seemed to him a satisfactory explanation of a strange phenomenon?

I should scarcely have thought it possible that Englishmen of character should have chosen the former alternative. I should indeed be astonished to find that Convocation accepted the responsibility.

THE INSCRIPTION ON THE CROSS.

Luke xxiii. 38.—St. Luke's account of the inscription being written in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, is omitted altogether in the text, without any mention in the margin of ancient authorities which support it.

It is a statement which has ever been regarded as peculiarly appropriate to the occasion and to the writer, a Gentile by birth, writing for Gentiles in the first place, and careful to notice that the three great divisions of mankind found place in this inscription.

Why was it omitted? Judging by other instances we might expect to find ℵ, B, in combination with D, and probably against a mass of external evidences.

But no; in this case D is not responsible. B and L (the satellite of B) alone concur positively in the omission, $\aleph^{ca}$ and C^{x} doubtfully; but B is followed by the Sahidic and Coptic, and is supported by Cureton's Syriac.*

The omission therefore is ancient; but to any one who considers the general character of these authorities it is sufficiently accounted for as originally an omission of carelessness, and adopted by a hasty calligrapher.

I do not believe that in any secular writing critics of sound judgment would have tolerated such an omission in face of evidence so preponderating as that which Tischendorf records against this. It includes eight uncials of high character, all cursives, the Italic, Vulgate, Syriac, Armenian, and Æthiopic Versions, and Cyril of Alexandria in his Commentary on St. Luke. Tischendorf further remarks the important fact that here there is no place for the usual charge of assimilation to Matthew or Mark. He suggests

* The "Two Revisers," p. 59, cite this as the old Syriac: but in p. 16 they say it is "assigned to the fifth century," and call it an "imperfect copy," inadequately representing an ancient text.

that it may be taken from John xix. 20. Surely any rational critic would have seen, on comparing the two accounts, that they are at once independent of each other, occurring in different connections, and that, as is very frequently the case with these two Evangelists, they mutually support each other—a fact of special interest in the question of evangelical correctness, and specially exemplified in this transaction.

Will Convocation sanction this omission, this total obliteration of St. Luke's evidence?

Matthew xxvii. 32-56.—In St. Matthew's account of the crucifixion the changes, with one exception, do not seriously affect the text.

In *v.* 34, instead of *vinegar* the Revisers have *wine* (in the Greek text *οἶνον*). This I have defended in my own notes in the 'Speaker's Commentary,' and have no doubt of its correctness. It stands on good authority, and is defended by Westcott and Hort (see Appendix, p. 20), on the same grounds as those which I had alleged. It is important as entirely removing the appearance of discrepancy between two Evangelists.

In *v.* 35 the English reader will be surprised to miss the reference to the 22nd Psalm, which in the Received Text and in the Authorized Version occupies a prominent place, which has in its favour internal probability, being in full accordance with St. Matthew's habit of citing prophecies, and in the account of the crucifixion he would undoubtedly have the words of that great Messianic Psalm before his mind. In my own notes, however, I had pointed out the weakness of the external evidence, and the probability that it was taken from St. John's Gospel. It is, however, questionable whether the Revisers were justified in omitting it altogether, without notice in the margin, as *a plain and clear error*.

In *v.* 42 we find, to our astonishment, that the margin

tells us "many ancient authorities add, *and another took a spear and pierced his side, and there came out water and blood.*" Few points have been generally regarded by critics as more certain than that this most striking and important fact is recorded by St. John alone; that it was added by him, on his personal attestation, to the accounts preserved by the other Evangelists, not only with a view to the completeness of proofs of our Lord's death, but to the significance of the event. But Westcott and Hort, who print it in their text, enclosing it in double brackets, evidently attach much weight to the external evidence.

It is extant in six uncial MSS., ℵ, B, C, L, U, Γ, all however belonging to one recension, the Alexandrian or Eusebian; but against its reception are twelve uncials, including D—which in cases of omission is regarded as a high authority by Westcott and Hort—Δ, Π, of the Alexandrian group, and all independent witnesses; also the Eusebian Canons, which assign it exclusively to St. John. Tischendorf sums up the arguments against it clearly and decisively. Dean Burgon had previously proved both the absence of proper authority for its insertion, and the circumstances which account for its interpolation.

Theologically the notice which, by the simple fact of its presence in the margin, implies a cautious but real commendation, is of real importance. It does not merely imply that St. Matthew records a true and weighty fact, but it misplaces the act: according to St. John the piercing took place after our Lord's death: a point of great doctrinal significance; but as the Revisers suggest the insertion, it would have occurred previously, and have been in fact the immediate cause of death. The testimony of Origen is decidedly adverse to the interpolation (*ἤδη δ' αὐτοῦ ἀποθανόντος εἷς τῶν στρατιωτῶν κ.τ.λ.*)—see tom. i. 418 c. It must not be overlooked that the "water and the blood"

present a phenomenon which, according to high scientific authority, could not have occurred before death. Critically it is important, as showing that ℵ, B, and L, generally conspicuous, as I venture once more to repeat, for their omissions, are capable of very serious, and exceedingly foolish interpolations; and also as showing that Westcott and Hort, in a singularly weak case, give up their own canon, which here might be applied with advantage, as to the weight of Codex Bezæ (D), when, instead of interpolating, that MS. bears witness to the absence of a disputed text.

In St. Mark's Gospel (xv. 39) the Revised Text omits the words *that he so cried out* (Gr. κράξας).

This is of real importance, for it gives a special reason why the centurion was moved to his great confession. It was the Saviour's last cry, with its full significance, with its attestation to the inherent power of Life triumphing over Death, to the fact that the surrender of Life was in the strict sense of the word a voluntary act, which wrought complete conviction—a conviction for which the way had been prepared by all the preceding circumstances, especially by our Lord's demeanour and words, but which needed and received the confirmation of His last loud heart-piercing cry.

In this case the Revisers appear to have been perplexed. The course which they adopted seems to me, I scarcely venture to say it, but say it I must, the very worst. They omit it altogether in the text, showing that at least two thirds of them finally agreed in rejecting it, acting, as it may be supposed, under the influence of Westcott and Hort, who pass it over without any note of doubt in their Greek text; but in the margin it is stated that "many ancient authorities read *so cried out and gave up the ghost.*" The statement implies acceptance of the words, but its supporters could not carry with them one third of the Committee in a case where they were undoubtedly right.

But what are the authorities? For the omission ℵ, B, L, supported only by the Coptic, and with that exception standing absolutely alone.

On the other side are arranged all other uncials, the whole mass of cursives, all other Versions, and among the Fathers the two who specially represent the intelligence of the East and of the West—Origen and Augustine, names which, in their somewhat rare concurrence on disputed points of criticism and interpretation, have a weight which of all men the Revisers might have been expected to recognize.

I take this to be one of the clearest, if not strongest, cases of unjustifiable innovation.

General Result of this Section.

So stands the case of the Revised Version as regards the evangelical accounts of the central event in the history of Redemption.

We find a mark of distrust, to say the least, affixed to the first, the specially characteristic word of the crucified Saviour;

The supernatural darkness accounted for by an astronomical impossibility;

An interpolation in St. Matthew's Gospel, involving an attempt at conciliation, but in reality presenting a serious contradiction of St. John's account;

The last solemn cry passed over in silence, just at the point where it is specially needed by the context.

For all these, and other less important innovations, the responsibility attaches to the authorities chiefly relied upon by the two leaders of the Committee on critical questions.

Will Convocation dare to take upon itself the responsibility?

SECTION VIII.

The Resurrection.

Matt. c. xxviii.—In the account which St. Matthew gives of this event, or rather of the circumstances under which it was first made known to the disciples, and of the appearances of our Lord afterwards, I find no innovations which affect the character of the transactions.

I do not notice the four omissions of words or sentences in *vv*, 2, 6, 9, 16; and I must also record my thankfulness that the Revisers have not adopted or noticed one innovation, which we may suppose was brought under their consideration by the two critics. In the 19th verse, left without mark or comment in the Revised Version, the Greek text of Westcott and Hort retain *βαπτίζοντες*, but in their margin suggest *βαπτίσαντες*. It is a singularly unfortunate reading, since it would imply that baptism was to precede all instruction in the faith.

Its importance consists entirely in its bearing upon the character of two MSS., which stand absolutely alone in maintaining it. First B, the infallible and pure Vatican, and D, in its Greek text, probably by oversight of a transcriber, since the Latin of that manuscript has *baptizantes*.

We turn to the account of St. Luke, c. xxiv. In it we meet with several omissions, some of grave, one at least of momentous importance.

In *v.* 3 the margin suggests the omission of "the Lord Jesus;" following D *alone* as MS. against the combination of every kind of external evidence. In *v.* 6, it also suggests an

omission of the important words, *He is not here, He is risen*, on the same authority and against the same consensus.

But now we come to an omission so grave, so vital in its bearings upon evangelical evidence, that we should indeed have been surprised had the Revisers adopted it in their text; we are only less surprised to find them notice it in their margin. The whole of the 12th verse, as the margin tells us, is omitted by *some ancient authorities*.

For this omission one manuscript alone, D, of all the most capricious and negligent, is quoted by Tischendorf. The other authorities are early Italic MSS., indicating early omission in the West, and an inference from the Eusebian Canons.

It would scarcely be supposed that the old Textus Receptus and our Authorized Version are supported by every other ancient MS., uncial or cursive, every other ancient Version, and among the Fathers by Eusebius himself in a passage where he speaks distinctly (ad Mar. suppl. iv. 286, 293), not to speak of Cyril Alex. in his commentary on St. Luke. Tischendorf himself says, "Patet hunc versum jam sæculo secundo a plerisque testibus lectum esse."

The notice is one of very peculiar importance. What it gives is the personal attestation of St. Peter to his own ocular observation of the state in which he found the empty sepulchre. It is precisely a point which he would naturally mention to St. Paul, when that Apostle abode with him fifteen days at Jerusalem (Gal. c. i.) for the special purpose of careful inquiry (ἱστορῆσαι). It is no less probable that St. Paul would be careful to impress it upon the mind of St. Luke, in order that it might stand out prominently in his record of the circumstances attesting the Resurrection.

The coincidence of the account, so far as it extends, with that given by St. John, agrees with numerous indications of a close connection between the third and fourth Gospels;

but on the other hand the omission in this passage of all notice of St. John's own presence proves the complete independence of the narrative, and disproves the suggestion, which, but for that circumstance, might seem plausible, that we have a case of assimilation.

It may be hoped that in a revised edition of the Revised Version, this and all similar notices in the margin, which leave the number and character of adverse witnesses a matter open to uncertain conjecture, will be explained, or better still altogether omitted, when the word *some* means an infinitesimally small minority.

One other omission in this chapter, one indeed of transcending importance, must be recorded. It is scarcely credible that in *v.* 36 the margin should tell us some ancient authorities omit the whole clause, one of the most beautiful in this beautiful Gospel, *and He saith unto them, Peace be unto you.*

Our astonishment increases when we look at the ancient authorities. For the sacred words stand the two MSS. which rank *first* in the revising critics' estimate, ℵ and B, supported by the whole body of MSS., uncial (with one exception) and cursive; the Sahidic and Coptic, in short all ancient Versions, and the Fathers who refer to this passage, Eusebius (ad. Mar. supp. 293 bis), Chrysostom, and Cyril Alex.

Against the words D stands again absolutely alone, with the exception of some MSS. of the old Italic Version.

It is a fearful thing thus to deal with the most solemn words on the most solemn occasion, on the first meeting of the risen Lord with the disciples.

Two other omissions may be passed over with two remarks: (1) The notice in the margin that *v.* 40 is omitted by some ancient authorities is misleading. The words are quoted as of considerable importance by Athanasius, tom. iii. p. 906, ed. Ben., by Eusebius, Epiphanius, and other

Fathers, and are found in every manuscript except D, and in every ancient Version except the old Italic, and Cureton's Syriac. (2) Again the evidence for the last part of *v.* 42 greatly preponderates over the authorities, though not unimportant, in deference to which it is omitted in the text of the Revised Version. I must reserve my remarks upon the last and crowning mutilation, that of *v.* 51, for the section in which I have to consider the evangelical record of the Ascension.

I pause only to ask once more, will Convocation accept the responsibility for the mutilated text of St. Luke?

St. Mark, however, is the great sufferer, if we may venture to apply such a term to the sainted Evangelist in reference to the mutilation of his Gospel—a mutilation without parallel in the critical history of the New Testament, so far as that history concerns those who believe in the veracity and inspiration of the sacred writers. The whole twelve concluding verses of this Gospel are separated from the preceding portion both in the English Revised Version, and in the Greek text published in the name of the Revisers, at Oxford under the superintendence of Archdeacon Palmer, at Cambridge of Dr. Scrivener. And here I must at once call attention to the very remarkable fact that that most cautious and judicious critic, the very foremost among those who in England combine reverence for God's word with the most thorough appreciation of every point bearing upon the criticism of the New Testament, should have given the sanction of his name to the form in which these verses appear in the Cambridge edition. That edition claims to give in the first place the Received Text, or, to speak more accurately, the text which was accepted by the translators in 1611, without alteration, subjoining the changes adopted by the Revising Committee. But no edition of the Received Text was ever issued, none could ever possibly have been issued, with these

verses of St. Mark thus separated from the rest. For this proceeding we may expect some strong reason may be alleged—for my part I cannot conjecture what the reason may be, unless indeed, which seems scarcely credible, that great critic allowed his own excellent judgment to be overruled by some person representing the feelings of the Revising Committee.

As for the enormous importance of the omission we have but to refer to the public statements of members of the Revising Committee. I have elsewhere quoted the words in which one of the most distinguished expresses his extreme gratification at the disappearance from what he calls St. Mark's genuine work of one of the very strongest assertions of the necessity of a real living faith. Far more important is another fact, to which I also alluded in a note on the last page of my commentary on St. Mark in the 'Speaker's Commentary,' viz., that the late Mr. Greg, one of the ablest and most influential representatives of modern scepticism, held that the omission in St. Mark's Gospel of all reference to personal appearances of our Lord after the resurrection obliterates the earliest and most authoritative attestation to that cardinal event.

But of all proofs of the importance attaching to the retention, or to the rejection, of the passage, none more striking can be adduced than the course pursued by Dr. Hort in the Appendix to the 'Introduction to Westcott and Hort's New Testament.'

He occupies some twenty-eight pages, closely printed in double columns, with an elaborate statement of the grounds on which he defends the mutilation. What he tells us at the end, p. 51, is that "it manifestly cannot claim any apostolic authority." Previously, in p. 36, he sums up the points, which are thus declared to be without apostolic authority, under five heads. "They contain (1) a distinctive narrative,

one out of four, of the events after the day of the Resurrection; (2) one of the (at most) three narratives of the Ascension; (3) the only statement in the Gospels historical in form as to the Session on the Right Hand; (4) one of the most emphatic statements in the New Testament as to the necessity of faith or belief; and (5) the most emphatic statement in the New Testament as to the importance of baptism."

So that these five points, touching cardinal doctrines, are divested of *apostolic authority*.

The arguments urged, with great ability, and, I would not use the word offensively, but I must say with remarkable subtlety, by Dr. Hort, could not here be fully discussed without breaking the thread of my own reasoning, in which I deal only with positive facts and broad statements; and presently I shall have occasion to revert to those arguments which appear to me to demand serious attention; but I will at once press upon all inquirers this general statement.

Dr. Hort does not impugn the fact, which of itself would seem to most inquirers conclusive, that with the exception of ℵ, B, L, every ancient manuscript, of all recensions and of all ages, has the contested verses; nor again that ℵ is the only manuscript which omits them without any indication of a hiatus; nor, though he notices, does he give any satisfactory reason for the very instructive fact that B leaves a blank space, contrary to its unvarying usage, thus proving decisively that the transcriber had a concluding portion before him.

Nor again does he deny that all ancient Versions, some of them 100 or 200 years earlier than the most ancient MS., have the missing passage; a very singular fact is passed over *sub silentio*, that the MSS. include those which are most commonly found on the side of B; and that whereas two very ancient Versions, the Syriac of Cureton and the Sahidic, are grievously mutilated, each preserves just enough of

the missing verses to prove their existence and their reception.

Nor again does he deal fully, I venture to say fairly, with the patristic evidence. He relies chiefly on negative evidence, which is universally admitted to be a very insecure foundation for unfavourable judgment in the face of clear positive testimony; and he is far from putting before his readers the enormous weight which attaches to the distinct attestation of Irenæus in the passage which I have quoted above (see p. 38), an attestation which, whether we consider the position, character, and age of the writer, or the peculiar force of his statement—not an *obiter dictum*, but applying to the whole structure of the second Gospel—ought to suffice to raise the question far above the range of controversy. Nothing indeed can be more striking than the contrast between the hesitating, varying, uncertain words of Eusebius, on the one hand, uttered with an avowed intention of meeting a difficulty, and on the other the plain, strong, clear words of the great pupil of Polycarp, speaking in the name of the Church, and resting on the authority of what all then admitted to be the Petrine Gospel.

For these and other points I would simply refer to the unanswered and unanswerable arguments of Dean Burgon in his palmary work, and to the decisive judgment of Dr. Scrivener, who *without any hesitation* maintains the authenticity of the whole passage.

I must, however, once more call attention to points affected, in addition to those enumerated by Dr. Hort.

(1) The first appearance of our Lord to Mary Magdalene, taken in connection with the very remarkable fact, on which the Evangelist lays special stress, that her evidence was not received by the apostolic body.

Both statements are of singular importance; the first because it is recorded in the Petrine Gospel, and refers to a

fact which St. Peter could specially vouch for, inasmuch as Mary Magdalene first addressed herself to him and to St. John, and because he knew that although her words sufficed to move him to act with his usual promptness and inquire for himself, they were far from carrying conviction. The second because the incredulity of the disciples is incompatible with the theory, skilfully maintained by the great French sophist, that belief in the Resurrection originated with Mary Magdalene. Here too I must remark that Celsus, the real originator of that sophistical argument, undoubtedly referred to this statement of St. Mark when he tells us that the whole story centred in the testimony of a *πάροιστρος γυνή*. I venture to say undoubtedly; because (*a*) it is evident that no word in St. John's Gospel, as Origen is careful to point out, suggests the view that Mary was then, or had been previously, in the state here described by the Evangelist and well expressed by the Greek *πάροιστρος*; and (*b*) because independent, and certainly in this case unbiassed, critics unhesitatingly refer the notice of Celsus to St. Mark, *e.g.* Anger in his Synopsis, p. 254, and in the appendix, p. xxvi.; and E. Renan in his last published work, 'Marc Aurèle,' p. 358, note.

We must also notice that the condemnation of this passage as non-apostolic (see above) destroys the harmony between St. Peter and St. John, very much in the same manner and to the same extent as the mutilation of St. Luke's Gospel, to which attention has previously been directed.

(2) We have again to notice the omission of the support which St. Mark, under St. Peter's teaching, gives to St. Luke's account of our Lord's appearance to the disciples—a support the more important as being evidently given without direct reference to that Gospel, from which this notice differs sufficiently to prove its independence, especially in the statement that the testimony of the two, like that of Mary Magdalene,

was not received by the Apostles. The incredulity of the Eleven is indeed indicated by their terror and astonishment at our Lord's personal appearance among them, but it is not stated directly by St. Luke; it is stated by St. Mark, and it has an important bearing upon a point which ought to be recognized as specially characteristic of his record, viz., that none of the disciples accepted any testimony to the fact of the Resurrection until they were convinced by a personal manifestation of their Risen Lord.

(3) If less important, yet not without significance is the loss of the most distinct promise of supernatural aid to the disciples which is recorded in the Gospels, fulfilled certainly in the case of St. Paul at Melita. I cannot but think that this promise was not only distasteful to Eusebius, as is clearly shown by his contemptuous rejection of the testimony of Papias,* but that it weighed with him in his hesitating rejection of this portion of the Gospel.

But putting aside this last point as of secondary importance, I ask, will Convocation dare to take upon themselves the responsibility of practically adopting Dr. Hort's statement that the whole section has no claim to apostolic authority?

THE ASCENSION AND THE SESSION AT GOD'S RIGHT HAND.

Here the most serious attention is called to the fact that in the evangelical narrative, so far as the Gospels are concerned, the only record of the last crowning event in the history of our Redemption—that event to which the Apostles St. Peter and St. John refer with peculiar emphasis, which St. Paul repeatedly dwells upon with reference to its spiritual significance—is found in the last verse but one of St. Mark's Gospel and in the 51st verse of the last chapter of St. Luke.

---

* See my note on Mark xvi. 17, 18, in the 'Speaker's Commentary.'

Both attestations are rejected, not indeed in the text of the Revised Version, but in the marginal notices, which but imperfectly express, but implicitly accept, the adverse judgment of the two critical guides.*

With regard to St. Mark's testimony we should observe that it accords with the whole purport of his Gospel, as comprehended by Irenæus, and by the ablest modern critics. His main object is to show the full manifestation of all powers involved in the great and glorious title, "the Son of God," which St. Mark prefixes to his Gospel—a title which, to the serious detriment of Christian faith, is noted as doubtful in the margin of the Revised Version: but of which the complete fulfilment was unquestionably the Ascension, that final crowning event to which St. Peter points in the first discourse recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, where he states fully and succinctly the special subject-matter of evangelical teaching, using the very word (ἀνελήμφθη) which we find, as might be expected, in St. Mark.

With regard to St. Luke's testimony we must also remark that in the very first words of his "second treatise," the Acts of the Apostles, he gives a clear, complete account of the purport of the Gospel, which, as he there tells us, concluded with the Ascension.

But on what authority is the verse, the only verse in his Gospel in which that statement appears, so mutilated as to obliterate the attestation altogether—mutilated, that is, so

* It must not be overlooked that these two passages are appointed by our Church to be read, one as the second lesson, the other as the Gospel in the Communion Service, on the Festival of the Ascension. I must also notice the very extraordinary state of the disciples' feelings in the account given by St. Luke, supposing that the suggestions in the margin of the Revised Version were adopted. The account would stand thus: *he parted from them, and they returned to Jerusalem with great joy: i.e.* rejoicing, not in their Lord's Ascension, but in His departure.

far as the right of using it is concerned, for those who attach full weight to the marginal notice that "some ancient authorities omit *and was carried up into heaven*"?

The omission of the words *ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν* is defended, the reader will scarcely believe it, on the ground that they are omitted in ℵ* and D, supported by some early Latin MSS.; whereas they are found in what Westcott and Hort call the purest document, B, followed by L, X, Δ, Π, and supported by the perfectly independent testimony of ℵ^{c}, A, and C: in fact by all other uncials, all known cursives, and all ancient Versions.

So ends the long list of omissions, corruptions, and plain clear errors in the first three Gospels chargeable to the Revisers as a body, for which, unless a formal disclaimer is put forth, beyond doubt the Southern Convocation will be held responsible.

THIRD PART.

SECTION I.

General Observations on the Results of the Preceding Inquiry.

We have thus traversed the entire course of an inquiry, which has brought us into contact with cardinal points of our Lord's teaching, and with cardinal incidents in His Life on earth, beginning with the antecedents and circumstances of His Nativity, and concluding with that event which all the sacred writers, none more distinctly than St. Peter and St. Paul, set before us as the consummation, both historically and doctrinally, of His Mission, viz., His Ascension, and Session at the Right Hand of His Father.

We might have expected innovations in matters of secondary importance, in reference to questions which at different ages of the Church have been contested among Christians; we were prepared to meet with omissions which would test our patience, and demand the most careful and earnest consideration: but what we never could have anticipated, considering the conditions under which the work of revision was entrusted to the Revising Committee, and the character and position of its leading members—what we should have deemed not merely improbable, but absolutely impossible—was assuredly that in reference to the central, the all-important incidents of our Lord's life, changes should have been either introduced into the text of the English

Version, or suggested in the margin, which would seriously affect the character of the sacred narrative; or that sayings of our Lord, especially precious to Christians, should either be rejected as spurious, or noted as doubtful, or mutilated, or so modified as to be divested of their peculiar significance, and thus lose their place, so far as the influence of the Revisers extends, in the consciousness of Christendom.

This result, or anything approaching to it, seemed *à priori* utterly incredible.* But on the first hasty perusal of the Revised Version of the first three Gospels, in common with the generality of readers, I was at once struck with the fact, which indeed lay on the surface, that this utterly unexpected result is actually realized; and that first impression was far from removed, it was confirmed and intensified, by careful and repeated examination of the passages to which I have called attention in the preceding pages.

Now it might perhaps have occurred to the minds of those who had viewed with alarm the absolutely unprecedented act of Convocation in admitting the co-operation of scholars of any or every school of religious thought, that such innovations must be attributable to some adverse influence—it might be to the persistent weight of a certain number of those scholars, chosen, it may be presumed, as representative men. But that impression could not but be

* I must here refer to the speech of Dr. Wilberforce, Bishop of Winchester, when he advised Convocation to authorize this Revision. "When this great undertaking came to be carried out it would be found that really the alterations would be so few, that the volume, though freed from errors which might shake its general authority, would be the same volume which we have now." I have quoted, at the beginning of this treatise, the still more precise and emphatic words of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol spoken on the same occasion. For both speeches see *Chronicle of Convocation*, Feb. 10, 1870, pp. 74–82.

dismissed as altogether unfounded, when we considered the regulations which the Committee of Revision at once adopted for its guidance. We are informed that no alteration was admitted into the text of the English Version, unless it was approved by a majority of two thirds of those present;* and that must have comprised in every case a majority, if not of Anglican Churchmen, yet of men fully agreed in fundamental principles.

When again we bear in mind that divines of the highest eminence, possessing the entire confidence of the Church, took part in the proceedings, we feel that a majority so constituted could not be open to suspicion on theological grounds. That fact indeed has been strongly urged by the ablest defenders of the Revised Version, such as Dr. Sanday and Dr. Farrar; and its importance has been fully recognized by those assailants who have gone furthest in expressing their dissatisfaction with the general result. It would indeed have been more satisfactory had we been assured that all, or nearly all, those divines had been generally present at the deliberations, and had taken part in the final decisions of the Committee; and we cannot but express our deep regret that some of the most distinguished for learning and for soundness in the faith were habitually absent from the discussions, and acquiesced at the most but passively in the verdict of their colleagues. However this may be, we bear in mind that the two critics, whose authority in critical questions is generally understood to have been predominant, were well known as men of profound learning and of deep religious convictions. Both of them stand fore-

* It appears therefore that the majority consisted of those members who alone took an active part in the Revision, being either present at the meetings of the Committee or signifying their decision by letter. *Some* changes, as it seems to me, could scarcely have been sanctioned by two thirds of the entire body.

most (together with the present Bishop of Durham, until lately their fellow Professor) among the maintainers of sound theology in the University of Cambridge. One of them has special claims to my own grateful acknowledgments as author of a noble commentary on St. John's Gospel; nor, although we might be somewhat alarmed by the epithet of *fearless* applied to Dr. Hort by the late Dean Stanley *—an epithet of questionable fitness in reference to dealings with the most delicate and grave points in the sphere of spiritual life—can we doubt that candour, truthfulness, faithfulness to the highest principles were from first to last the animating motives which actuated those scholars and the Revisers who followed their guidance.

To this it must be added—it is a point indeed on which Dean Stanley and Dr. Kennedy † lay great stress—that Dr. Scrivener was one of the most constant and painstaking attendants at the meetings of the Committee. And if we had reason to believe that his opinions or his arguments carried with them the weight to which they were especially entitled, we should have felt there were good grounds for confidence in the general result. That weight is indeed so great in the estimation of independent scholars, that we should have expected him to be consulted, not merely as an advocate for his own reading—here I speak exclusively of questions of textual criticism—but as occupying a position nearly approaching that of an arbiter; if not entitled to claim acquiescence when maintaining his own view, yet

* In the article published in the *Times*, on July 20, 1881, to which I have referred more than once in my 'Second Letter to the Bishop of London.'

† See 'Ely Lectures on the Revised Version of the New Testament,' by B. H. Kennedy, D.D. This treatise is prefaced by a Dedication to Dr. Scrivener.

as one whose judgment should have sufficed to bar the adoption of decisions to which he was adverse, especially in reference to changes which, as no one will question, cause a serious shock to the great body of Christian readers. When however we observe on the one hand that in nearly every question of vital importance the adverse judgment of that eminent scholar had been previously recorded in his 'Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament;' * and on the other hand, that we have the testimony of Dr. Kennedy, second to none among the Revisers in point of scholarship, to the fact that at present Dr. Scrivener retains the main positions which he then defended, we cannot but see that the decision of the majority was little influenced by his authority; and consequently that it is divested of the weight which his concurrence would have imparted to it.

I have felt it right, indeed necessary, to state thus at length the general impression made upon my mind by what had transpired, and is now positively known, about the proceedings of the Committee of Revisers. Before I go further I will also state briefly another point to which I shall have occasion to recur presently. The substantial alterations in the text of the New Testament, if not absolutely confined to the second and third Gospels, occur far more frequently and to a far greater extent in them, than in other portions which I have been able to examine with proper care. The changes in the text of the Acts and of the Pauline Epistles are comparatively small in number, and, what is of more importance, they do not affect doctrinal or spiritual truths, to the same extent, or in the same manner, so far as the text is concerned. Take for instance the Epistle to the Romans. We find between 190 and 200

Strongly adverse judgments of Dr. Scrivener will be found on pp. 472, 473 ter, 474 bis, 475 bis, and in c. ix. pp. 493–524.

alterations in the Greek text, of which a small number only are perceptible in the English Version, whereas in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, some 1500 changes are adopted, many of them of the highest importance. To anticipate what I have to say presently, this is simply owing to two facts: (*a*) that the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, and of the Revisers, is founded upon, I may say, virtually identical with, that of the Vatican MS.; and (*b*) that in the Acts and in the Pauline Epistles* that text in nine passages out of ten is in accordance with the text of the Alexandrian MS., which represents most completely the readings adopted by all the great Fathers of the fourth and following centuries, and which are generally followed in the cursive manuscripts, especially in those which appear to have been the chief authorities for what is called the 'Textus Receptus,' which, as Dr. Scrivener and others have shown, is the foundation of our Authorized Version. This is indeed a fact for which we have reason to be exceedingly thankful. It saves the student of the Epistles many a painful shock; but it enhances our regret that in the very centre and foundation of all Christian teaching, the remarkable discordance between the recension followed in the Greek text of the Revised Version, and that on which our old Version is based, should have impressed upon the former a character so strange, and so repugnant to the feelings of English Churchmen.

Here too I may call attention to another fact, too frequently overlooked, and certainly not occupying in Dr. Hort's 'Introduction' the place to which it is entitled. Manuscripts of the whole of the New Testament were

---

* Dr. Hort, Int. § 262, gives ℵ, B, C, D, L as the "primary documents" for the Gospels, ℵ, A, B, C, with some others, for the Acts and Epistles. Thus A is excluded as a high authority from the Gospels only.

excessively rare in the early ages of Christendom. Separate manuscripts of some portions were common, especially of the Gospels; so that when we find such manuscripts as A and B agreeing closely in some books, and differing widely in others, we may fairly conclude that in the one case the scribes had a common exemplar, or a copy of one recension before them, and that in the other they had wholly independent copies. Applying this to the case under consideration we infer that the scribe of B—the diorthota of ℵ—had a copy of the Gospels which differed from that followed by A, especially in readings peculiar to the school of Origen; and consequently that in cases of serious differences we should call for the independent testimony of early Versions and the great Fathers of the Church.

But important as I cannot but hold these considerations to be, they are not, in the present state of critical inquiries, the most interesting to readers. Men's minds have been violently shaken; they have been loosed from their old moorings; they are compelled to inquire into the grounds on which innovations have been adopted; nor, although the question cannot be dismissed or shirked as to the relations between Convocation and the Revising Committee, will that long occupy men's minds. We must ask, we must have our answer to the question, what is the character and substantial value of the documents on whose authority changes are proposed and defended, which touch the veracity or the integrity of the Holy Scriptures, and more especially affect the teaching of our Lord.

In order to put the question fairly before the reader's mind it will be advisable, in the first place, to classify the innovations to which we have called attention; in the next place, to see how far each class of these innovations is supported by or opposed to ancient authorities; and thirdly,

to inquire into the grounds on which "paramount" * if not exclusive authority is attached to some few documents by the critics who are specially responsible for the most important innovations.

---

* See Dr. Hort, Int. p. 195: "The question is whether the documents accepted as primary can safely be allowed an absolutely paramount authority."

SECTION II.

Classification of Passages in which Serious Innovations have been introduced into the Text or suggested in the Margin of the Revised Version.

As my special object in this section is to show to what extent the two oldest manuscripts and other documents of the same order are severally responsible for the innovations to which I have called special attention in the second part of this work, I have arranged those innovations under distinct heads, and to the references showing in what passages of Scripture they occur I have subjoined a list of the uncials which are alleged in their support. The reader will find full notices of other authorities in the detailed examination which has been previously given. It must also be kept in mind that the uncials which are not here cited as supporting the innovations are adverse to them.

(i.) Passages in which most important words of our Lord have been omitted:

Injunction. Matt. v. 44 (p. 50).

א B

Two words. Matt. vi. 4 (p. 53).

א B L Z and א B D Z

The Doxology. Matt. vi. 13 (p. 56).

א B D Z

The reference to fasting. Matt. xvii. 21 and Mark ix. 29 (p. 74).

א^{x} B

Part of Messianic prophecy. Luke iv. 19 (p. 71).

א B D L Ξ

Last injunctions to the Twelve in Galilee. Mark ix. 44, 46, and 49 (p. 77).

א B C L Δ and א B L Δ

Warning to Disciples. Luke ix. 54, 55 (p. 80).

א A B C E G H L S V X Δ Ξ

Lord's Prayer. Luke xi. 2, 4 (p. 85).

א B

On marrying a divorced woman. Matt. xix. 9 (p. 89).

א C^3 D L S

In the institution of Holy Communion. Luke xxii. 19, 20 (p. 98).

D

The first words spoken on the Cross. Luke xxiii. 34 (p. 105).

$א^a$ B D^x

"Peace be unto you." Luke xxiv. 36 (p. 119).

D

(ii.) Incidents of supreme importance omitted :

The agony in Gethsemane. Luke xxii. 43, 44 (p. 101).

$א^a$ A B R T

The inscription on the Cross as recorded by St. Luke, xxiii. 38 (p. 112).

$א^{ca}$ B C^x L

The last cry. Mark xv. 39 (p. 115).

א B L

St. Peter's visit to the Tomb. Luke xxiv. 12 (p. 118).

D

The appearances after the Resurrection as recorded by St. Mark, xvi. 9 seq. (p. 120).

א B L

The Ascension. Mark *l. c.* and Luke xxiv. 51 (p. 125).

א* D

(iii.) Passages which alter words of our Lord, substituting common-place, incongruous, or incorrect statements for utterances specially remarkable for depth, force, and dignity:

Close of the Sermon on the Mount. Luke vi. 48 (p. 66).

א B L Ξ

Words spoken to Martha. Luke x. 42 (p. 88).

א B C² L

Words concerning the colt. Mark xi. 3 (p. 95).

א B C* D L Δ

(iv.) Passages which as they stand in the Revised Version assert what is either historically incorrect, or physically impossible:

In the Genealogy wrong names. Matt. i. 7, 8, 10 (p. 23).

א B C

Prophecy assigned to the wrong prophet.* Mark i. 2 (p. 36).

א B D L Δ

Serious historical error, touching Abiathar. Mark ii. 26 (p. 69).

א B L Γ

Another historical error, in reference to the daughter of Herodias. Mark vi. 22 (p. 72).

א B D L Δ

Eclipse of the sun at full moon. Luke xxiii. 45 (p. 110).

א B L

---

* N.B. I must here ask the reader to look at the note on Matt. xiii. 35. It does not apply to the text used by the Revisers, but to that of Westcott and Hort's edition, where the very serious innovation is noticed in the margin and defended in the Appendix.

(v.) Alterations objectionable on various grounds stated in Part II., chiefly as omissions:

Mark i. 1. *υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ* omitted (p. 35).
א*

Matt. i. 6 (p. 24).
א B Γ

Matt. i. 18 (p. 25).
א B C P S Z Δ

Luke i. 28 (p. 26).
א B L

Luke ii. 14 (p. 27).
א* A B* D

Luke ii. 40 (p. 33).
א B D L

Luke ii. 43 (p. 33).
א B D L

Luke iv. 4 and 5 (p. 43).
א B L

Mark i. 5 (p. 41).
א^c B D K L

Mark i. 14 (p. 44).
א B L

Mark i. 27 (p. 45).
א B L

Mark i. 40 (p. 68).
B D G Γ

Mark ii. 16 (p. 69).
א B D

Matt. v. 4, 5, transposed (p. 48).
D

Matt. v. 22 (p. 49).
א B

Matt. vi. 1 (p. 51).
א*,b B D

Matt. vi. 10 (p. 54).
א B Z Δ
Matt. vi. 12 (p. 54).
א* B Z
Matt. vii. 4 (p. 64).
א B
Matt. vii. 13 (p. 65).
א*
Luke vi. 1 (p. 69).
א B L
Luke x. 1 (p. 87).
B D M R
Luke x. 15 (p. 87).
א B* D L Ξ
Luke xv. 21 (p. 92).
א B D U X
Mark x. 21 (p. 90).
א B C D Δ
Matt. xix. 16, 17 (p. 91).*
א B D L
Mark xi. 8 (p. 96).
א B (C) L Δ
Mark xi. 26 (p. 97).
א B L S Δ
Matt. xxvi. 28 (p. 98).
א B L Z
Matt. xxvii. 49—an interpolation (p. 113).
א B C L U Γ
Luke xxiv. 3, 6 (p. 117).
D

To these passages I now add the following, remarkable for omissions, or corruptions:

* See Scrivener, Int. p. 498 seqq.

Matt. xvi. 2, 3.

ℵ B V X Γ

Matt. xviii. 15.

ℵ B

Matt. xxiii. 4.

ℵ L

Matt. xxiii. 38.

B L

Luke xvi. 12.

B L

Luke xxi. 24.

B

SECTION III.

Result of Classification.

The outcome of this inquiry, which is confirmed by reference to other changes, some of which have been previously noticed, others being omitted as of subordinate importance, may be stated as follows.

(i.) Evidence of MSS.—The two oldest MSS., ℵ and B, either separately, or for the most part conjointly, are responsible for nearly every change which modifies, and, we may say without hesitation, weakens or perverts records of sayings and incidents in our Lord's life: in fact, for every change of importance, excepting four of the very gravest character, for which D, the Codex Bezæ, is the only authority among uncial MSS.

It will also be observed that ℵ and B are very often supported by L, a manuscript of the eighth or ninth century, which agrees with B in its general character, and in most cases of disputed readings agrees with it so closely as to justify the conclusion that, if not a direct transcript of that manuscript, which is hardly probable considering the number of variants, it was a transcript from an early copy. This general agreement gives special weight to its evidence on some important points where it is opposed to the innovations introduced into the text of the R. V., on the authority of the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts.

In addition to these we find Δ, Γ, Π, and X, Ξ, and the cursives 1, 33, in frequent accord with those two oldest

manuscripts.* On the other hand A, the Alexandrian Codex, is almost invariably at the head of the long list of uncials which oppose the readings of ℵ, B, and their congeners, in the passages which have been examined in these pages, and in the immense majority of disputed readings in the first three Gospels. Twice only in passages of serious importance we find A supporting what I must call the erroneous readings adopted by the Revisers in their text, or noticed with commendation in their margin.

OTHER ANCIENT AUTHORITIES.

On further examination the reader will also find that other authorities, to which, in some cases, a higher value is to be assigned, as being more ancient and better attested than any MSS., may for the most part be classified as agreeing generally either with the uncials ranged on the side of B, or with those which follow or support A.

(ii.) EVIDENCE OF ANCIENT VERSIONS.† Thus he will find, as a general rule, that (*a*) the *Syriac Peshito*, the Version which probably comes nearest to the autographs of the Evangelists, especially of St. Matthew, supports the old Received Text in the passages which I have dwelt upon as of special importance: but that at the same time it agrees with B, and the recension which is represented by that MS., sufficiently often to prove that both the translator and the transcriber had before them ancient documents of the same general character. When they differ the question must be raised which of them represents the original text more truthfully: and for my

* Dr. Hort names ℵ, B, C, D, L as the "primary documents" for the Gospels. It will be observed that C very seldom supports ℵ, B in the passages above cited.

† For Dr. Hort's views on ancient Versions, see his 'Introduction,' § 213–219.

own part I do not doubt that the Version is the more trustworthy, especially as evidence against omissions. In fact, in the great majority of disputed readings that which has its decided support has a *prima facie* claim to preference, if not to absolute acceptance. The other Syriac Versions are either much later, as the Philoxenian or Harcleian, or of doubtful authority. The Curetonian is most valuable in reference to the first Gospel. Some of its readings are of considerable importance in reference to St. Mark and St. Luke.

(*b*) *Early Italic and Vulgate.*—As to the early Western Versions it would be incorrect to speak of the recension which they represent, for the MSS. vary to an extent incompatible with the theory that they were derived from any common source, or were subjected to any critical authority. Jerome and Augustine indeed speak of the MSS. most common in their age as full of every kind of fault—of omissions, perversions, and interpolations—a statement to which the Codex Bezæ, D, supplies ample corroboration. Still their acknowledged antiquity, and, notwithstanding those grave defects, the good faith and piety of their writers, secure for them a high place among recognized authorities. The Vulgate follows them closely throughout the Gospels. If the reader would learn what evidence they afford in the most important instances, he has to ascertain what side is taken by the MSS. marked *a*, *b*, the Codex Vercellensis and Codex Veronensis, the two best and oldest MSS. of the Italic Version, or again by *f*, the Codex Brixianus, which is to a great extent independent of both. The Vulgate is best studied in the Codex Amiatinus, lately edited by Tischendorf: it is cited as *am.*

Speaking broadly these MSS. agree with B more frequently than with A; but that agreement adds considerably to their weight when they differ from the former, as is the case in

some of the most important passages which have come under our consideration.

(*c*) *The Egyptian Versions* are of exceeding weight in this discussion. They rank among the most ancient, and the most carefully preserved.* The Memphitic, generally cited as the Coptic, has all the books of the N. T.; the Sahidic or Thebaic has considerable fragments, especially of the Gospels. I have compared the readings of both in the editions of the *S. P. C. K.* (see above, p. 33, on its value) and of Woide, with ℵ, B, and A. As a general rule both of them agree closely with B, an agreement conspicuous in minute points of grammar, the use of tenses and the definite article, and in readings which often strike us as singular if not startling. They agree indeed so closely as to force upon us the impression that they not only belong to the same school, but that they follow the same recension.

Here again the conclusion is obvious, I venture to say, incontestable, that, in the cases where they differ substantially from B, where their readings are in fact irreconcileable with it, such difference proves that the one or the other follows a corrupt document, whether corrupt by omission or by interpolation; and in those cases we have to decide between the two by the testimony of other authorities at least equally ancient and equally weighty.

Applying this to a few crucial instances, we see at once how it weakens—if it does not absolutely overthrow—the authority of those MSS. which omit (1) the leading point in the title of St. Mark's Gospel; (2) the Doxology in the Lord's Prayer; (3) the most heart-stirring incident in our

* I say this in reference to the MSS. of the Coptic or Memphitic. A critical edition, with a complete account and correct estimate of the various readings, is a desideratum which ought to be supplied by one of our universities.

Lord's agony; (4) His first word on the cross; and (5) the whole concluding portion of the Gospel of St. Mark.

(iii.) EVIDENCE OF ANCIENT FATHERS.—Here the reader may be embarrassed by the multitude, and the contradictory character of the citations in Tregelles and in Tischendorf's eighth edition. Let him first see what evidence is supplied by the earliest and best Fathers of the Greek-speaking Church; foremost among whom and by far most weighty from age, character, and position, stands Irenæus. Observe the testimony which he gives in reference to the beginning and the end of St. Mark's Gospel, and to incidents omitted or noted as questionable by the Revisers. Then, passing on at once to another and far different school, let him observe how many and how important are the points on which Origen, of all Fathers the one who, in his numerous citations, has the text most closely corresponding to Codex B, casts in his unsuspected and momentous weight into the opposite scale. Above all, in counting and weighing the evidence of the ante-Nicene Fathers he should be on his guard against the utterly fallacious argument from negatives. Westcott and Hort speak strongly upon that point, but do not bring it to bear upon some questions of exceeding moment. The circumstance that a Father does not quote a passage—especially if he wrote at a time or belonged to a school in which so-called "diplomatic accuracy" was scarcely heard of—proves nothing against its existence. In fact in one passage on which, in spite of that dictum, Dr. Hort lays great stress,* the omission is accounted for in the simplest and most satisfactory manner. Cyril of Jerusalem does not allude to the last verses of St. Mark's Gospel in his 'Fourteenth Catechetical Lecture,' in which he adduces scriptural

* See 'Introduction to the Greek Text of Westcott and Hort,' Appendix, p. 37.

proofs of the Resurrection, Ascension, and Session at the Right Hand of God. Such is the negative evidence. But in the opening clauses of that portion of his argument Cyril expressly states that on the previous day he had expounded the scriptural lesson which contained a complete account of the incidents connected with the Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord.* Now it is proved that the most ancient lectionary-systems, which are more ancient than either B or ℵ, contained the last verses of St. Mark's Gospel, in the lesson appointed for certain days, especially for the great festival on which Cyril appears to have delivered the discourse to which he refers in that lecture. I cannot but regard Dean Burgon's argument on the one side, and Dr. Hort's on the other, as remarkable instances of the use and the misuse of vast learning and of equally remarkable subtlety. The facts are simple, incontrovertible; and in my opinion they add force to the warning, never to be lost sight of by students, that one positive fact is of infinitely more importance than the most plausible arguments drawn from the silence of an early writer.

In considering the references to the authority of the ante-Nicene Fathers, the reader cannot fail to be struck by the testimony, all but unanimous, which they supply in reference to passages of signal importance, especially to the records of our Lord's words, and of incidents connected with the last and most solemn portion of the Gospel History.

* See Burgon's 'Last Twelve Verses of St. Mark's Gospel,' p. 195, where Cyril's words are quoted in full. Cyril refers repeatedly to the exposition which he had previously given, an exposition which of course made it unnecessary for him again to cite Mark xvi. 19, or Luke xxiv. 51, or Acts i. 9.

SECTION IV.

Value of the two oldest Manuscripts, ℵ and B.

We are now brought face to face with one of the most difficult and important problems in the history of biblical criticism.

One point comes out distinctly. The two oldest MSS. are responsible for nearly all the readings which we have brought under consideration—readings which when we look at them individually, still more when we regard them collectively, inflict most grievous damage upon the records of our Lord's words and works.

I repeat that, with two exceptions, to which notice has been called, those innovations rest upon the authority of ℵ and B, sometimes supported by a minority of other MSS., but in many serious instances standing absolutely alone.

On the other hand, the two critics, whose views are fully stated, and supported by arguments equally remarkable for learning and ingenuity, in their 'Introduction' written by Dr. Hort, hold that the Vatican manuscript is "supreme in excellence," that it alone represents "the purest text," that it is to a singular extent "free from interpolations," that it has "no suspicious colouring," that where it is supported by the only other MS. which has claims at all resembling it for antiquity and excellence, its authority is final, "absolutely decisive," and that even when it stands quite alone it is entitled not merely to respectful consideration, but to practically unlimited deference.

And this opinion they have illustrated by the most

decisive act. They have produced a Greek text, in most substantial points identical with that published on the authority of the Revisers, but which goes much further, inasmuch as, alone of all published texts, with exceedingly few and unimportant exceptions, it virtually reproduces the text of the Vatican manuscript. In fact, had they given us a revised edition of the Vatican, merely correcting the itacisms, and other manifest blunders of the copyist*—neither small in number, nor unimportant in their bearings—it would have scarcely been distinguishable from that which now stands before us on their authority. Having compared chapter after chapter, book after book in their edition with Tischendorf's 'Vatican Codex of the New Testament,' I can attest that this coincidence is all but uniform. Nor indeed could it well be otherwise; since they tell us sometimes distinctly, often by implication, that in this manuscript, especially when taken in combination with ℵ, we have the nearest approach to a faithful transcript of the very autographs of the Apostles and Evangelists.

The grounds on which this very decided opinion of the two critics rests, are, as I have said, fully stated in the 'Introduction' to their text of the Greek Testament. That introduction was written by Dr. Hort, but it expresses the views which they held in common, and which they certainly succeeded in impressing upon the minds, if not of all, yet of the majority of scholars, either belonging to the Committee of Revisers, or in a position which justified their coming forward in its defence.

To examine these grounds with any approach to completeness would demand a very long, and probably inconclusive process of discussion. It must be observed that the argu-

* And with reference to such blunders Dr. Hort says, "the scribe reached by no means a high standard of accuracy," Introd. § 312. Then Tischendorf speaks of the *vitiositas* of B and ℵ. See below, p. 172.

ments of Dr. Hort are presented in what Dr. Sanday calls "a predominantly abstract form,"—a form which he admits to be at once difficult to follow, and not likely to be generally convincing. He tells us that "the reader may rest assured that these seeming abstractions rest upon a most solid and laborious collection of facts."*

This call upon the reader's faith involves a severe strain; the facts may be solid and collected with much labour, but they are seldom put before us, and throughout the 'Introduction' are assumed rather than proved. We must always bear in mind that the opinions of the two critics were formed, or developed, in a course of most earnest and thoughtful study extending over thirty years, and pursued with every advantage, with all the resources of a great university both as regards materials and learned co-operation. But the field of inquiry which now demands our attention is limited; we have simply to inquire what evidence, external or internal, is adduced, or adducible on principles adopted by the Revisers, that the two manuscripts are not only generally deserving of confidence, for their purity and pre-eminent excellence, but so far entitled to deference that the Revisers are justified in introducing on their authority innovations into the sacred text, which, as we have shown, are derogatory to its integrity or its veracity, and materially affect the records of great central events and sayings in the Life of our Lord. Probabilities, conjectures however plausible, inferences from a system which, whatever may be its fascination for acute intellects and speculative minds, is open from first to last to question, are as dust in the balance weighed against matters of such vital importance. We demand facts, facts which can be ascertained, which are not capable of being explained away; and most astonishing facts they must be if they are to

* See the *Contemporary Review*, December 1881, p. 986.

compel us to surrender, or to regard as doubtful, such a word as that spoken by our Saviour on the cross, and the attestation of two Evangelists to the Resurrection and the Ascension of our Lord.

We look then first at the historical facts which stand out most prominently, about which there is no difference of opinion.

(1) We know approximately the age of the two oldest documents. It is admitted that the Vatican, it is all but certain that both the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts, were written about the middle of the fourth century. We know also that some other manuscripts, such as A, C, Q, T, Z, were written so soon after that date as materially to affect the position claimed for those two codices, and repeatedly urged by some critics, as though they were entitled to unqualified deference on the ground of what Dr. Hort * calls "their exceptional antiquity."

This date is of great importance; it reminds us at once of the very long interval—nearly three centuries—which had elapsed since the time when our Gospels were given to the Christian world, an interval filled with events of singular interest, with persecutions, storms within the Church, vicissitudes and trials of every kind. It reminds us also that the very time, at which those two manuscripts are admitted to have been written, coincided with a temporary, but complete, preponderance of the Arian heresy, and that the person who at that time was most conspicuous for learning, and especially for ability and reputation as a critical scholar, was deeply affected by that heresy—Jerome calls him "propugnator Arianæ factionis." To these points I shall have to recur presently; here I simply ask the reader to bear both facts in mind. We have two manuscripts written some three

* Intr. to Westcott & Hort's New Testament, p. 92.

hundred years after the original text was published; we have to admit that just at the time when they were written, the best, the only sound, part of the Church, was in a state of depression without previous precedent or later parallel.

Looking back from that time, we are surprised at the paucity and the uncertainty of facts which might enable us to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion on the state of the text at any given period.

(2) The fact nearest in time, and of most importance, is that Lucian*—a presbyter of Antioch, a native of Samosata who was put to death at Nicomedia A.D. 312—and about the same time Hesychius, an Egyptian Bishop, took special pains with the revision of the text of the Septuagint Version, and as it would seem also with that of the New Testament. We know that when Jerome was occupied with his Version he found manuscripts written by, or under the superintendence of, Lucian and Hesychius, of which in his Epistle to Damasus he speaks slightingly, but which were regarded by some as presenting a carefully revised and pure text. His words are important: "Prætermitto eos codices quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos paucorum hominum adserit perversa contentio: quibus utique nec in veteri instrumento post septuaginta interpretes emendare quid licuit nec in novo profuit emendasse, cum multarum gentium linguis scriptura ante translata doceat falsa esse quæ addita sunt." †

---

* "Lucianus vir disertissimus, Antiochenæ ecclesiæ presbyter, tantum in Scripturarum studio laboravit, ut usque nunc quædam exemplaria Scripturarum Lucianea nuncupantur." Hieronymus, 'Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiast.' 77.

† Præf. in IV. Evangelia ad Damasum, tom. x. 661. The adverse judgment of Jerome, at a later period, appears to have been generally adopted in the West. Thus in the 'Decreta Gelasii et Hormisdæ' (quoted by Hilgenfeld, 'Einleitung,' p. 137) we read: "Libri omnes, quos fecit Leucius, discipulus diaboli, apocryphi." Innocentius also reckons them among apocryphal books.

From this we have a right to infer (*a*) that the number of copies bearing the name, as issued under the authority, of one or the other, or of both those Churchmen, must have been considerable, and that some hundred years after the demise of Lucian they were maintained as of high authority by what Jerome, an impetuous and unfair controversialist, designates as the perverse contention of a few persons. (*b*) We must also infer, if we accept Jerome's statement, that the Recension, if that name is properly applied to their work, was remarkable for interpolations. But it seems probable, considering the character of Jerome, that by *addita sunt* he may refer to innovations generally, especially to statements which affected the integrity of the books, and the veracity of the narratives. (*c*) Jerome lays down a principle of the highest importance, one to which in this discussion special attention is demanded, viz. that all variations and innovations of importance can be and ought to be tested by their accordance with the ancient Versions, which conveyed the truths of the Gospel to different nations.

The question how far the text thus produced agreed with one or the other of the two recensions, which Dr. Hort and Dr. Westcott think fit to call Pre-syrian and Syrian, is of course a matter of doubtful conjecture. But we have facts which lead us some way towards a probable conclusion. Lucian was beyond doubt, as a scholar and divine, moulded under the influences of a school of which Origen is the chief representative. It is also clear that, at the earlier part of his life, he had gone very far in the direction of latitudinarianism: he was accused of decidedly heretical opinions, and, though recognized by the most orthodox Churchmen as a sound-hearted and right-minded Christian man, fully entitled to the glorious designation of a faithful martyr, it is admitted that traces of old opinions and tendencies were discernible to the last. Whether those tendencies affected his recen-

sion, or, if they affected it at all, to what extent, is of course wholly uncertain; but in addition to the fact that he belonged to the school of Origen, we have the no less certain and equally significant fact that he found in Eusebius an enthusiastic admirer. That historian rises to real pathos and eloquence in describing his character, his scholarship, his martyrdom; nor can it be doubted that his labours in the criticism and exegesis of the Scriptures were fully appreciated by Eusebius, with whom he had so many points in common, especially as regards the influences under which the religious character of both was moulded.

One fact, at least, is certain. The term Syrian recension, if admissible at all, is applicable to the copies written under the superintendence of Lucian of Antioch. That is the only recension connected with Syria of which any notice occurs in ancient documents; I must add, for which any place can be found in the history of the Church between the second and fifth centuries.

Is it too much to infer that the work of Lucian materially affected the critical and biblical labours of Eusebius, or that, if, as I hold to be all but certain, the two oldest manuscripts were written under the superintendence of Eusebius, they retain some of the chief characteristics of that recension? If that be the case, we must apply Jerome's remark that all innovations should be brought at once to the test, whether they are opposed to, or are supported by, the best ancient Versions.

As to Hesychius, less is known, less is even probably conjectured; but I am fully disposed to accept the views of some able critics who believe that his work is fairly represented by the oldest Egyptian Version.* Whether, however,

* Jerome says (c. Rufin. ii.) that Egypt followed the Hesychian recension. He is speaking of the Septuagint, but there can be no doubt that the remark applies equally to the New Testament.

he simply adopted that Version, as it then stood, or modified it to some extent, cannot be determined in the absence of positive evidence.

That Version undoubtedly does represent the Alexandrian text as it stood early in the third century, or even probably as it stood in the second. Comparing it with the citations in Origen, we note on the one hand a real independence in readings of considerable importance, as may be seen by reference to the passages which we have previously examined; on the other, so much general similarity as to confirm the opinion of critics who regard them as proceeding from the same school. Not less striking is the same combination of general resemblance and special independence, when we compare that Version with the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts: a point to which I shall have to call attention presently, but notice here as bearing upon the character of what has been called, somewhat boldly, the Hesychian recension.

(3) We go back one step further, a most critical and important step, for it brings us at once into contact with the greatest name, the highest genius, the most influential person of all Christian antiquity. We come to Origen. Now it is not disputed that Origen bestowed special pains upon every department of biblical criticism and exegesis. His 'Hexapla' is a monument of stupendous industry and keen discernment: but his labours on the Old Testament were thwarted by his very imperfect knowledge of Hebrew, and by the tendency to mystic interpretations common in his own age, but in no other writer so fully developed or pushed to the same extremes. In his criticism of the New Testament Origen had greater advantages, and he used them with greater success. Every available source of information he studied carefully. Manuscripts and Versions were before him; both Manuscripts and Versions he examined, and brought out the

results of his researches with unrivalled power. But no one who considers the peculiar character of his genius, his subtlety, his restless curiosity, his audacity in speculation, his love of innovation, will be disposed to deny the extreme risk of adopting any conclusion, any reading, which rests on his authority, unless it is supported by the independent testimony of earlier or contemporary Fathers and Versions. The points in which we are specially entitled to look for innovations are—(1) curious and ingenious readings, such for instance, as those which we have noticed in St. Mark and St. Luke; (2) the removal of words, clauses, or entire sentences which a man of fastidious taste might regard as superfluities or repetitions; (3) a fearless and highly speculative mode of dealing with portions of the New Testament which might contain statements opposed to his prepossessions, or present difficulties which even his ingenuity might be unable to solve. In weighing the evidence of his citations for or against any doubtful reading, while we should feel assured of his perfect honesty of purpose, we ought to be extremely cautious in adopting his conclusions. A text formed more or less directly under his influence would of course command a certain amount of general adhesion; it would approve itself most especially to minds similarly gifted and similarly developed; when brought to bear upon the course of critical inquiry it would produce an enormous effect, especially if it came with the charm and interest of novelty; but not less certainly would it be challenged, and its verdict be refused, if it contravened principles of fundamental importance and affected the veracity of the sacred writers and the teaching of Holy Writ.

Now when we once more apply these observations to a text, which on other grounds we maintain to be substantially or completely identical with that which was published under the influence of Eusebius, we are driven to the conclusion that

such characteristics are to be looked for; and that, so far as they can be shown to exist, they impair, if they do not overthrow, the authority of that text in matters so weighty as those to which we have devoted attention in this discussion. That Eusebius was an enthusiastic admirer, a devoted adherent of Origen, no one need be reminded who knows aught of the history of that age, or who has read, however hastily, his history of the early Church; that in all questions he would defer absolutely to the authority of Origen, especially in questions of criticism, is almost equally undeniable; nor do I hesitate to state my immoveable conviction that in that influence is to be found the true solution of the principal phenomena which perplex or distress us in considering the readings of the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts. This point, however, I propose to discuss at length in a separate section.

(4) But have we no earlier authorities than Origen? I have answered this question more than once. There were once abundant materials, but unfortunately our actual knowledge of them is imperfect and fragmentary. Copies of Holy Scripture abounded in Western Christendom; the so-called early Italic Versions carry us back to the earliest post-apostolic age; but we can scarcely refuse to accept the positive statement of Jerome in his well-known Epistle to Damasus, the Bishop of Rome, under whose authority he undertook the most formidable and responsible of all works, that of producing a new or revised Version of the Scriptures. In answer to the attacks of opponents, moved by feelings common enough in the case of all new undertakings, and imputed, as a matter of course, to all who venture to criticize a work remarkable for novelty, Jerome says: "Si latinis exemplaribus fides est adhibenda, respondeant, quibus: tot sunt enim pene quot codices." A strong, perhaps an exaggerated statement, such as accords with the style of a controversialist at once unscrupulous and bitter, but which

leaves no room for doubt as to the untrustworthiness of manuscripts which represent the early Italic recension.

To state the general result shortly, we have no reason to believe that the immense number of copies of Scripture, or, to speak more correctly, of portions, especially of the Gospels, diffused through the East and West of Christendom were at any time subjected to a general superintending authority. We may be sure that in every quarter of Christendom they were prepared and examined with the greatest care; but speculations as to their relative value and mutual interdependence, however ingenious and plausible, as to their "genealogical" and "transcriptional" peculiarities, ought not to be allowed to bias our judgment in estimating the value of documents now existing, each of which should be tested on its own merits with the most careful regard to internal and external indications of its intrinsic worth.

SECTION V.

The Eusebian Recension.

Hitherto our inquiry has brought us into contact with theories of exceeding interest, but resting on insecure foundations; the facts being few in number, and rather gathered from incidental notices than from direct statements by trustworthy authorities. These facts suffice to prove that the copies of Holy Scripture, both in Eastern and Western Christendom, were numerous; that the diversities of readings had attracted general attention, and occupied the minds of theological scholars; but they leave us in a state of considerable embarrassment, and quite uncertain to what extent the ingenious and highly technical system, presented with singular ability in Dr. Hort's 'Introduction,' may be applicable. We feel the need of some central facts, some statements on which implicit reliance can be placed, connected with a distinct and critical period in the history of the Church, and recorded in documents now accessible and bearing the stamp of high official or ecclesiastical authority.

The epoch at which such facts might be naturally looked for is assuredly that in which the Church emerged from its condition of external humiliation and desperate struggles, and in which the tendencies by which it had long been internally disturbed culminated in massive proportions; on the one hand, in a heresy which—owing in part to the ability of its chief leaders, but mainly to its subtle appeals to some of the strongest feelings of half-Christianized people, and to its combination of rhetorical and philosophical artifices with skil-

ful manipulation of scriptural texts—rapidly acquired and long retained a hold upon the minds of some of the ablest and most influential representatives of religious thought; on the other hand, in a full development of the principles which from the beginning had been more or less distinctly recognized as fundamental by earnest and devout Christians, and which found full and adequate expression when for the first time all quarters of Christendom, by the voices of their representatives, decided the great question at issue, in the great œcumenical council of Nicæa.

Very few years had elapsed, less than ten years in fact, from that central event, when the transaction occurred to which I now call attention. When we consider the condition of the Church at that time, the clear and uncontested authority on which the all-important facts rest, and the position of the persons with whom we are concerned, we cannot hesitate to assign to this transaction not merely a high place, but the very highest place in the history of the criticism of the New Testament.

The date is fixed absolutely within narrow limits. In the year 330 Constantine formally celebrated the completion of his great work, the foundation of Constantinople. In the year 340 at the earliest Eusebius died.*

In the interval between these two certain dates—probably, as we shall see, nearer the beginning than the close of the interval—Constantine wrote a letter to Eusebius, then Bishop of Cæsarea, which we have before us in the Life of Constantine by Eusebius, book iv. c. 36; in the following chapter, c. 37, Eusebius gives a full account of the result.

In this letter Constantine first states a fact of exceeding importance† in the history of Christianity, showing the

* See Bishop Lightfoot's article on Eusebius in the 'Dictionary of Christian Biography,' vol. ii. p. 318.

† See my remarks in the 'Second Letter to the Bishop of London,' p. 79 seq., in reference to this fact.

rapidity of its external progress under imperial influence. This fact is that in the city which bore his name an immense number of people had already joined themselves to the Church—note the force of his expression, *μέγιστον πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀνατέθεικεν ἑαυτό.* He adds that inasmuch as there is a great and growing development of the city in all respects, it is evidently most desirable that many new churches should be established in it.

The Emperor then calls upon Eusebius to order without delay the transcription of fifty manuscripts of the Holy Scriptures on carefully prepared parchments or vellum (*ἐν διφθέραις ἐγκατασκεύοις*), written in easily legible characters, and in a portable and convenient form (*πρὸς τὴν χρῆσιν εὐμετακόμιστα*). The manuscripts were to be written by calligraphers, beautiful penmen, thoroughly understanding their art (*ὑπὸ τεχνιτῶν καλλιγράφων καὶ ἀκριβῶς τὴν τέχνην ἐπισταμένων*).

Constantine dwells upon the immense importance to the Church of having the Scriptures thus carefully written and adapted for common use; his words are often cited, as showing the paramount weight attached to the study of the Word of God at that critical period in the history of the Church—*τῶν θείων δηλαδὴ γραφῶν ὧν μάλιστα τήν τ' ἐπισκευὴν καὶ τὴν χρῆσιν τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας λόγῳ ἀναγκαίαν εἶναι γινώσκεις.*

The Emperor then tells Eusebius that he has sent instructions to the Treasurer of the province, the highest civil functionary, to supply all things required for the preparation of the parchments, and impresses upon Eusebius the duty of getting the manuscripts completed with all possible expedition. That no time may be lost in transmitting them from Cæsarea to Constantinople, Eusebius is formally authorized to employ two public vehicles, so that the "beauti-

fully written manuscripts"—a point to which he thus again specially refers—may be brought before the Emperor's eyes in the most convenient manner. He bids Eusebius entrust one of his deacons with the duty of conveying the precious documents safely and speedily, and promises to reward that envoy in a manner befitting his liberality. The letter closes with the affectionate salutation, "May God preserve thee, beloved brother."

In the following chapter Eusebius records briefly and distinctly the speedy accomplishment of the work, *αὐτίκα δ' ἔργον ἐπηκολούθει τῷ λόγῳ*. He adds a few words which are important as showing both the great costliness and the peculiar form of the manuscripts. He describes them as *τρισσὰ καὶ τετρασσά, i.e.* according to Valesius, Tischendorf, and Scrivener, in quires called in Latin writers "terniones" and "quaterniones," that is in triple or quadruple sheets, presenting of course twelve or sixteen pages. The words, however, as it appears to me, may refer to the arrangement, peculiar to the two oldest MSS., ℵ and B, in which each page is written in three or four vertical columns respectively.*

* I advance this suggestion with some confidence, having consulted some eminent Greek scholars, who agree with me as to its great probability. I observe (1) that the two words are exceedingly rare, and are not, so far as I can ascertain, elsewhere used in connection with manuscripts. (2) Their literal meaning is "three by three," and "four by four," words which exactly describe the arrangement of the columns in each page of B and ℵ. (3) No corresponding ordinal is derived from *πέντε*, such as would have been necessary to describe the arrangement of Codex B, to which Tischendorf applies the word "quinio," *i.e.* fivefold quire. (4) It is probable that Eusebius would call special attention to the triple and quadruple columns, which are supposed to have been copied from a MS. on papyrus, indicating an Egyptian recension, to which, as a follower of Origen, he would attach a high value. (5) The conjecture of Valesius, that the two words were equivalent to the well-known Latin terms "ternio" and "quaternio," was natural, in fact almost forced upon him, at a time when no example of an arrangement in three or four vertical columns was in existence. (6) Had Eusebius wished to describe the

Take now the facts concerning these fifty manuscripts.

First the external facts.

(1) They were remarkable for the excellence of the materials on which they were written.

(2) They were equally remarkable for the beauty of the characters, written by the best calligraphers who could be found by the Bishop of Cæsarea.

(3) They were to be executed—and it is recorded that they were executed—with the utmost possible speed.

The combination of extreme care bestowed upon the form with extreme speed or haste in the execution is a peculiarity scarcely to be looked for under ordinary circumstances.

As a general rule copies of the Scriptures were prepared in separate portions, of course with the utmost care, certainly not under pressure of time, by monks carefully trained in calligraphy and in habits of exact transcription. A manuscript thus prepared would be prized rather for its exactness and the authority attached to its readings, than for the beauty of its form. When a convent had leisure and means to produce costly manuscripts, the excellence of the writing would in every case be inseparable from extreme care in the transcription.

To this it must be added that the materials had to be procured and most carefully prepared, a process which would necessarily occupy a considerable time—as may be inferred from the singularly fine vellum on which the Sinaitic Codex is written: made of the skins of asses or of antelopes, a single animal supplying but one sheet.* The time therefore at

manner of folding the sheets, he would naturally have used words compounded of a cardinal number and a termination implying folds, such as *τριπλόα*, *τετραπλόα*; such words were in common use and specially applicable to the case.

* See Tischendorf, 'Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum,' Proll. p. xvii. The number of skins must have far exceeded any quantity that could have been kept in store for ordinary purposes. One hundred and forty-

the disposal of Eusebius for the transcription would be so far shortened as to make extreme haste in that part of the work especially urgent.

So far we have data, which, by reason of their rarity and unquestionable authenticity, must go far towards determining the origin of any manuscript of that date in which the same peculiarities are admitted or can be shown to exist.

Before we proceed to this point we must take into careful consideration the state of the Church at the time; the relations between the Church and the Empire, and the exact position of Eusebius in reference to both.

We may assume that the letter to Eusebius was written soon after the dedication of Constantinople; but some time must have elapsed before the Emperor could be satisfied that the number of converts was so great, and increasing so steadily, as to make it necessary or expedient to build a considerable number of churches. I doubt whether the letter could have been sent before the year 332, and allowing a reasonable time for the purpose of preparing materials, collecting and collating manuscripts for the use of scribes in writing fifty copies of the whole Scriptures, I should think A.D. 334 a far more probable date than 331, usually accepted for this transaction.

Now in the year 330 Arius was received on terms of amity by Constantine, who addressed a courteous letter of welcome to him on the 25th of November.* In the following year Eustathius, the orthodox Bishop of Antioch, was deposed from his see by the Arian Council of Tyre. In the same year,

---

eight skins were required for one copy of the Sinaitic New Testament, three times as many for the Old. For fifty copies of the whole work an enormous number of skins had to be procured, and prepared with the utmost care, for the manuscripts demanded by the Emperor.

* See M. de Broglie, 'Histoire de l'Eglise et de l'Empire,' tom. ii. p. 284, note.

A.D. 331, Eusebius of Nicomedia, the ablest and most influential leader of the extreme Arian faction, wrote a letter to Athanasius, calling upon him to receive Arius into communion.

Eusebius of Cæsarea was offered the see of Antioch, but was wise enough to decline it.* From that time his influence over Constantine was unbounded ; an influence considerably strengthened by the assiduous court which he paid to the favourite sister of the Emperor, giving her name Constantia to a city in his diocese, which he speaks of as lately converted from fanatic heathenism; a course which, he tells us, was highly approved by Constantine.

Turning to Egypt, we observe that Athanasius remained at Alexandria, but under the ban of the Arian faction and the disfavour of the Emperor, until he went into banishment, A.D. 336.

We have thus a clear and full account of the position of parties in Christendom at the date when those famous fifty manuscripts were prepared and sent to Constantinople.

The facts so elicited supply solid grounds for the inquiry as to what in all probability would be the internal characteristics of manuscripts prepared at such a time, under such circumstances.

In the first place we do not hesitate to admit that they would be generally remarkable for substantial accuracy ; no interpolations are to be looked for. Eusebius was a man of honour, too prudent as well as too honest consciously to introduce corruptions of the text; his wide learning was not more conspicuous than his conscientiousness in dealing with the facts of Holy Scripture.

---

* Eusebius has preserved the letter which Constantine addressed to him on hearing that he had declined the see of Antioch. The Emperor especially commends his wise moderation—*ἡ σὴ σύνεσις, ἣ γοῦν τάς τε ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὸν Ἀποστολικὸν κανόνα καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας φυλάττειν ἔγνωκεν ὑπέρευγε πεποίηκε, παραιτουμένη τὴν Ἐπισκοπίαν τῆς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν ἐκκλησίας.* Vita Const. lib. iii. c. 61, p. 518, ed. Vales.

If in any work he would be careful to maintain his well-earned character for diligence and sound judgment, it would be in a work destined, under the imperial influence, to remain as a guide and chief authority in the great city of Constantinople.

It may be added that afterwards when Chrysostom, the ablest and soundest teacher of the Church, occupied the episcopal throne in that city, no imputation of corruption or unfairness is alleged in the homilies in which that great man expounded large portions of the Scripture. And I may here remark, *en passant*, that in none of his earlier homilies, those for instance which were delivered at Antioch, and are justly counted as the most thoroughly sound and complete expositions of two Gospels and Epistles, is there any indication that Chrysostom was aware of a substantial difference between the text which he himself used and that of Eusebius, which must have been familiar to all students—such difference as is assumed by Dr. Hort and intimated in his classification of Syrian and Pre-syrian readings.

Still, on the other hand, there are many passages in which, without conscious dishonesty or unfairness, traces of theological opinions, strongly and consistently maintained by a reviser of the text, might be looked for. In cases of disputed or doubtful readings, which could not but occur frequently in the actual state of recensions or written authorities at that time, it would be too great a strain upon our candour or credulity to assume that a preference would not be shown for that reading which favoured the views of the party of which Eusebius was an avowed partizan, and, with all his discretion, an earnest defender.* Consciously, or unconsciously, as is unquestionably the case with translators,† critics and even

* Jerome, who follows Eusebius in critical questions closely, not to say slavishly, speaks of him as "signifer Arianæ factionis." Cont. Rufinum, lib. ii.

† See Dr. Ranke's words, quoted above, p. 42.

transcribers are influenced by their dominant tendencies and prepossessions.

For instance, in the most important text, Romans ix. 5, the mere insertion of a stop would go far to eliminate a decisive proof of our Lord's true and proper divinity, the very central point in the Arian controversy. According to some authorities, the stop is so inserted in some MSS.—of which we have presently to speak—and Dr. Vance Smith points triumphantly to the countenance given to that punctuation in the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, and in the marginal note of the Revised Version.*

Again in passages where the choice lay between θεός and words which lower or obliterate the meaning, we might expect that the latter would be adopted. Of course all doubtful texts, not supported, or weakly supported, by documents previously accepted as authorities, would disappear.

But if there were any one distinct instance, any one *crucial* passage, in which the whole weight of Eusebius, as a biblical critic, was thrown into one scale—in which on exegetical and harmonistic grounds he would be anxious to rid himself and his fellow Christians of any considerable passage which countenanced what he believed to be erroneous statements, and which he had rejected in other writings as a spurious addition to a Gospel—we might calculate to a certainty that the effect would be seen in the rejection or total obliteration of such a passage in manuscripts written under his absolute control.

---

* The discussion of this passage does not properly belong to this essay; but I must press upon every reader the duty—I use the word "duty" emphatically—of reading the admirable note of Dr. Gifford in the 'Speaker's Commentary.' I should scarcely have thought it credible, in face of the unanswered and unanswerable arguments there urged, that English divines would venture to have given their sanction to one of the most pernicious and indefensible innovations of rationalistic criticism. For Dr. Vance Smith's statement see 'Revised Texts and Margins,' p. 32 seq.

One other characteristic, and it is of the last importance in the inquiry, must be looked for in a recension conducted by Eusebius. It would bear evident marks of the influence of Origen: not merely because Origen, as we have seen, had a well-earned reputation for learning, keen insight, literary tact, and spiritual discernment, but because of all authorities in such matters Origen stood highest in the estimation of Eusebius. To this reference has already been made. I am bound to call attention to it here. The position of Eusebius is stated completely and forcibly by Jerome, 'Contra Rufinum,' i. § 8: "Sex libros Eusebius Cæsariensis Episcopus, Arianæ quondam signifer factionis, pro Origene scripsit latissimum et elaboratum opus, et multis testimoniis approbavit, Origenem juxta se catholicum, id est, juxta nos Arianum esse." *

We have now to see whether any manuscripts now extant meet all the conditions which are implied in the preceding description of the Eusebian recension.

The first indispensable condition is that of time. The recension, as we have seen, was made between A.D. 330 and 340: probably some five or six years before the latter date.

Two manuscripts, and two only, are assigned to the earlier half of the fourth century. One, the Vatican Codex, B, is admitted by all critics to have been written in or about the decennium before the middle of that century. The other, the Sinaitic Codex, ℵ, has not commanded the same unanimity of critical consensus. Some critics of eminence have disputed its antiquity; still the opinion of Tischendorf, so far as regards the proximate age of the manuscript, has been borne out so far by close and dispassionate inquiry, that little if any real

* I do not accept this statement of Jerome so far as regards the imputation of Arianism to Origen, whose substantial orthodoxy has been fully vindicated by Bishop Bull, 'Defensio Fidei Nicænæ,' 2 c. ix.; but it is conclusive as to the close connection between Eusebius and Origen.

doubt can reasonably be entertained on that point. The further question, whether that critic was right in maintaining its priority to the Vatican Codex, stands on different grounds. I hold, as a fact which has been demonstrated, that both manuscripts were written about the same time and in the same country; but if either was in part copied from the other, or written later under the same influences, the Vatican was in all probability the older, the Sinaitic the younger. This I have to consider further on; here I venture to assume as a recognized fact that these two manuscripts, alone among extant documents, do satisfy, and fully satisfy, the condition of time. They are certainly contemporary with the Eusebian recension, and if so, there is a strong *prima facie* probability that they were written at the same place and under the same superintendence.

Two other conditions are equally indispensable. The first is extreme care in external form—beauty and excellence of materials, beauty and excellence of writing.

Now in these respects the two manuscripts are admitted to hold a foremost, indeed an exceptional position.

The Vatican Codex is described by all critics who have had the opportunity of examining it, as remarkable for the fineness and beauty of the vellum; until the Sinaitic Codex was discovered, it was wholly without a rival for the grace, nobleness, distinctness, and beauty of its calligraphy.* In both respects the Sinaitic Codex equals, if it does not surpass it. It has been stated above that one antelope supplied materials for one sheet only of this manuscript, and Tischendorf's account of its remarkable beauty is admitted to be without exaggeration. As for the beauty of the writing, readers have full opportunity of forming a judgment. They

* "Species libri pro typorum pulchritudine, et chartæ præstantia satis elegans est." Tischendorf, 'Nov. Test. Vaticanum,' Appendix, p. ix.

need but compare the facsimiles in Scrivener's 'Introduction,' the photographs in Dean Burgon's work on the last verses of St. Mark, or the specimens in Tischendorf's edition of the two manuscripts, to be fully satisfied that though approached in some respects by a few other uncials, yet on the whole these two MSS. are by far the best extant specimens of early calligraphy.

This first condition must therefore be regarded as absolutely satisfied.

But secondly, we have to take into consideration another characteristic. As we have seen, the Emperor impressed upon Eusebius the duty of getting the work done with all possible expedition. He urges him repeatedly to speed, to extreme haste. A command so notified, urged by a prince of imperious and impatient character, could not fail to override all other considerations; provided that good copies were supplied to the writers, that the best and most thoroughly trained calligraphers were employed, Eusebius would not be disposed to look with much severity upon defects inseparable from rapidity of execution. Omissions of words, clauses, and sentences not absolutely indispensable for a right understanding of the purport of any given passage might escape attention, or if noticed might be excused; a sheet faulty in points which the critic might regard as of secondary importance would scarcely be cast aside, considering the loss of time, not to speak of the cost, which would be incurred by an attempt to replace it. I hold it to be certain that traces of extreme haste would be found in such manuscripts.

Are such traces found in either or in both the manuscripts with which we are specially concerned?

The answer is scarcely open to doubt. The omissions in the synoptical Gospels, which I deal with exclusively in this essay, are perfectly amazing for number and extent. It is calculated by a very able and careful critic (quoted by Dr.

Scrivener, 'Introduction,' p. 108) that Codex B leaves out words, or whole clauses, no less than 330 times in St. Matthew, 365 times in St. Mark, 439 times in St. Luke.

This computation does not exceed the result to which my own independent examination of the new readings in the Greek texts of the Revisers and of Westcott and Hort had led me. In fifteen chapters of St. Mark I found 653 changes, in St. Luke 837. A very large proportion, more than one half, roughly speaking, are omissions; and for nine tenths of these omissions one or both the manuscripts under consideration are the principal, in fact all but invariably the only, authorities.

But here I am met by the very weighty and very authoritative statement of the two critics, repeated more than once, and in very peremptory terms, that it is illusive to describe these variations as omissions; that so far as they affect passages of any importance they are but indications of the singular purity, the freedom from interpolations, from "conflate readings," useless repetitions, which they take to be the characteristic excellence of both, and of the Vatican MS. more especially. Such a dictum it is somewhat hard to deal with; but with the utmost deference to the judgment of those critics I cannot but maintain that if the majority of those readings, which we call omissions, are subjected to any external test, if tried by any other measure than that of the manuscripts themselves, they will be convicted as defects, or blunders, or innovations more or less erroneous, to whatever cause the mischief be attributable. The tests to which I would refer are, first, the more ancient and trustworthy Versions; secondly, citations in ante-Nicene Fathers; and thirdly, the consensus of manuscripts, including those which in doubtful cases so generally coincide with ℵ and B as to leave little room for doubt that their text was founded on the same original authorities. To this I must add the very important statement

of Dr. Scrivener, 'Introduction,' p. 108: "That no small proportion of them—*sc.* the omissions noticed above—are mere oversights of the scribe, seems evident from a circumstance that has only come to light of late years, namely, that this same scribe has repeatedly written words and clauses *twice over*, a class of mistakes which Mai and the collators have seldom thought fit to notice, inasmuch as the false addition has not been retraced by the second hand, but which by no means enhances our estimate of the care employed in copying this venerable record of primitive Christianity." In a note upon this passage Dr. Scrivener quotes words of Tischendorf, which are conclusive as to that critic's opinion of the carelessness—which I attribute to excessive haste—of the copyist of the manuscript. Speaking of gross blunders in the recent Roman edition of the Vatican Codex, Tischendorf says, "Tamen hæc quoque satis cum *universa* scripturæ Vaticanæ VITIOSITATE conveniunt." Appendix to N. T. Vatic. p. xvii.

These remarks apply with at least equal force to the Sinaitic Codex, of which Tischendorf uses the same expression, "magna scripturæ vitiositas." See N. T. Sinaitic. Introd. p. xxxv. § v. One instance of extreme negligence occurs towards the end of St. Mark's Gospel, in which that manuscript omits *v.* 47 in c. xv., and the first clause in c. xvi. —an omission noticed and supplemented by an early corrector.

I refer also to the weighty testimony of Dr. Scrivener in his Introduction (p. xv.) to the 'Collation of the Sinaitic MS.' "This manuscript must have been derived from one more ancient, in which the lines were similarly divided, since the writer occasionally omits just the number of letters which would suffice to fill a line, and that to *the utter ruin of the sense;* as if his eye had heedlessly wandered to the line immediately below. Instances of this want of care will be found, Luke xxi. 8; xxii. 25, perhaps John iv. 45; xii. 25; where complete lines are omitted. It must be confessed,

indeed, that the Codex Sinaiticus abounds with similar errors of the eye and pen, to an extent not unparalleled, but happily rather unusual in documents of first-rate importance; so that Tregelles has freely pronounced that "the state of the text, as proceeding from the first scribe, may be regarded as *very rough*."

Two points must here be borne in mind. The Sinaitic MS. was written by at least four copyists; a considerable portion was at once recognized by Tischendorf as written by the calligrapher who appears to have been employed throughout the Vatican manuscript. The point is important for various reasons: first, if it be accepted as a fact, it leaves no doubt, that the two manuscripts were written at the same time, the same place, and under the same general superintendence. Secondly, it bears very forcibly upon a point of even greater importance to be noticed in the sequel (pp. 232–5), the mutilation of St. Mark's Gospel; that portion of the work being among the passages which Tischendorf fixes upon as certainly written by the Vatican calligrapher.* It also shows a singular and very unexpected carelessness in the choice or use of documents which the calligraphers had to copy, inasmuch as the readings vary to an extent which, though it does not affect the substance of the text, proves that the same writer actually had before him different manuscripts when he wrote the two portions now before us. Tischendorf infers from this that they bear independent and therefore valuable testimony to the readings which he adopts in both; and in this view he is supported by Dr. Hort, who regards it as an evidence of their common origin from some far more ancient text. I venture to maintain that we have, together with the proof of singular and

* See Tischendorf's 'Nov. Test. Vaticanum,' p. xxii., and Dr. Hort's 'Introduction,' § 288.

inexcusable negligence, a clear indication that the copyist, under the direction of Eusebius or the "corrector," followed two recensions, and most probably gave the preference to that which kept the text as received or amended by Origen, or by Lucian, of whose labours and influence we have spoken above.

But I must further call attention to another fact, which surprised me exceedingly, which I could scarcely have accepted as probable or possible, but for the decisive testimony of Tischendorf, a scholar certainly not biassed by any prejudices against this manuscript. I have noticed above that it was usual, in cases of such importance, to employ a corrector of the manuscript, generally a professional scribe, called in Greek διορθωτής, Latinized by Tischendorf as *diorthota*. His duties are thus described: he had to correct faults in the copy, and to supply any omissions of negligence. But I will quote his own words: "Et hoc et illud in librum Vaticanum quadrat, cujus primum correctorem sive diorthotam maxime hoc egisse adparet ut omissa suppleret, et vitiosa emendaret; nec vero prorsus ab inferendis lectionibus abstinuit, quas aliunde quam a textu libri descripti sumere deberet."* Of both courses Tischendorf gives instances; and so far we certainly might seem to have a security against numerous or serious blunders, especially in a document of transcendent importance, intended, whether at Constantinople or in any other city, to remain as a κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί, an official witness to the true text.

But, as I intimated, a great surprise awaits us. In the following page (xxv.) Tischendorf writes thus: "If however any one should believe that that corrector did his work diligently, he would be grievously mistaken. For it appears to have been generally the custom of those correctors, as mere

* See 'Novum Testamentum Vaticanum,' ed. Tischendorf, Proll. p. xxiv.

hirelings, in order to get through their work rapidly, to be satisfied with such corrections and remarks as might be made with ease in a hasty perusal and collation of the manuscript. They did just as much as attested the fact that they had corrected the manuscript, and did not scruple to leave many points untouched which had the greatest possible need of correction."

Here however we might pause, and look for an exception in the case of a manuscript, which Drs. Westcott and Hort regard as one of "supreme excellence," beyond all comparison "the purest and most free from errors of all now in existence:" but Tischendorf expressly adds, "Quod quantopere in diorthotam codicis Vaticani quadret, *quævis inquirentem pagina docet;*" that is to say, every page of this manuscript bears the plainest evidence of the carelessness and haste of the corrector, and of course of the copyist, whose negligence called for the most careful and diligent supervision.

Taking the calculations of the critic quoted by Scrivener as granted—and they certainly are borne out fully by my own inquiry so far as it has extended—we must admit that the omission of not less than 2556 words or clauses in the Vatican Codex, which does not go beyond Hebrews ix. 14, must have fallen in with the inclinations of a scribe, and have been lightly admitted by a superintendent, who were acting under imperative directions to produce the work with all possible speed.

For my part, I can scarcely conceive any combination of circumstances which could have produced results apparently so incompatible as the highest finish in external form, and the utmost haste with its concomitant negligence, save that for which we have the most positive evidence in the letter of Constantine and in the account of the execution of the work given by Eusebius.

In monasteries the transcriptions were always made by

members of the conventual body; haste and carelessness were of all faults least to be looked for in the leisure of the convent, in the work of men who, whatever may be thought of their discretion, were beyond all doubt heartily devoted to the Master whose word was thus entrusted to their diligence; but in the busy city of Cæsarea, in the midst of harassing controversies and engrossing avocations literary and ecclesiastical, Eusebius, himself not improbably acting as diorthota, could scarcely have risen above the temptation, not to idleness—that was not his temptation—but to hasty discharge of an onerous duty under the pressure of imperial urgency.

We have now to ask the reader to consider the very peculiar force of arguments which lead to the conclusion that the two manuscripts were written under the superintendence of Eusebius, which in fact taken together leave scarcely any room for doubt that they were written at a time when the influence of the school which he represented was completely in the ascendant.

I will not dwell upon indications of Arian tendencies. They are not such as we should be entitled to rely upon. As I before said, Eusebius was certainly above the suspicion of consciously introducing false statements or of obliterating true statements. As was the case with many supporters of the high Arian party, which came nearest to the sound orthodox faith, Eusebius was familiar with all scriptural texts which distinctly ascribe to our Lord the divine attributes and the divine name, and was far more likely to adopt an explanation which coincided with his own system, than to incur the risk of exposure and disgrace by obliterating or modifying them in manuscripts which would be always open to public inspection. The student has but to read his treatises against Marcellus to be convinced of the fairness and truth of this statement.

Still there are passages in which the choice between two readings, each having the support of early recensions, either Western, conspicuous for what Reiche calls "socordia et licentia," or Alexandrian, bearing traces of the distinctive tendencies of the Origenistic school, would be influenced by the avowed preference of Eusebius; and when we consider the very serious list of omissions and corruptions imputing incorrect (not to use a stronger and more offensive word) statements to the Evangelists, many of them especially derogatory to the character of the Saviour and logically incompatible with an entire faith in His proper and true Divinity, we can scarcely admit that either of the two manuscripts can be exonerated from the imputation, if not of heretical pravity, yet of a leaning towards semi-Arian tenets.

But I speak more decidedly upon two points. Whatever may be said of the arguments alleged for or against the authenticity of the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel, one thing is certain. Eusebius is the earliest writer—I may safely assert the only writer up to the end of the fourth century—who ventured to impugn them: in this singular course he was unquestionably biassed by a desire to rid his own mind, and that of Marinus, who had consulted him on the subject, of the perplexity, caused by what might seem to him, and has been represented by others, and seems to be admitted by Dr. Hort,* to be the impossibility of harmonizing the first part of that portion with the other Evangelists, especially St. Matthew. For my own part, I think it very probable that other points in those verses would be exceedingly distasteful to him. In my note on *v.* 18 in the 'Speaker's Commentary,' I have noticed the contempt Eusebius expresses for Papias, who gave credence to a transaction which literally exemplified the fulfilment of our Lord's promise. I do not think

* See 'Introduction,' Notes on Select Readings, p. 51.

that he would feel less repugnance than that expressed by the late Dean Stanley* to the doctrines stated with uncompromising force in the 16th verse; nor can we but remember that the removal of those verses, combined with an equally bold dismissal of St. Luke's statement, c. xxiv. 51 (see above, p. 125), obliterates the testimony of the Gospels to the Ascension of the Lord and His Session at the Right Hand of God.

However this may be, we have here a positive unquestionable case in which Eusebius, standing out against *all* ancient Versions, *all* the earliest and best Fathers of the Greek-speaking Church, takes the position which is supported by these two manuscripts, and by these alone, up to the eighth or ninth century, when they were followed by a single authority, the Codex L, which is little more than a transcript of the Vatican manuscript.

But in connection with this point there is a most singular and startling peculiarity, for which I can conceive no probable or rational explanation save that supplied by the hypothesis of Eusebian superintendence. One of the manuscripts, B, omits the verses, but leaves a blank column after that which contains the last verse of the mutilated Gospel—a proof, as I have elsewhere noted, that in the copy before the writer a closing portion was given.† In the other MS., ℵ,

* I cannot but allude to some remarkable points of resemblance between that great and good and genial divine in our own age and Eusebius, both courtiers conspicuous for an influence in the palace well earned by noble and attractive qualities, both historians remarkable for skilful use of materials collected with unusual care and employed with equal discrimination and skill, and both, it must be added, so remarkable for noble qualities as to retain a place of high estimation in the judgment not only of those who sympathized with them in latitudinarian tendencies, but with the firmest and most consistent maintainers of the old unvarying doctrines of the Catholic Church.

† Dr. Scrivener speaks very decidedly on this point. "By leaving a space the scribe has intimated that he was fully aware of the existence of the missing verses, or even found them in the copy from which he wrote." 'Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament,' p. 98.

no such space is allowed. The Gospel of St. Mark ends, as does every other book of the New Testament, in a column of which the remaining portion, and that portion alone, is left blank—the following column beginning with St. Luke.

Now we have seen evidence, as Tischendorf proves, and as Dr. Hort admits (§ 288), that a portion of the Sinaitic Codex was written by the scribe of the Vatican, and the portion containing the end of St. Mark's Gospel from c. xv. 2, and the first part of St. Luke's Gospel, is the principal example of that very remarkable proceeding.

What more natural, what more probable, than the conjecture—nay, I venture to ask what more cogent than the evidence thus supplied—that Eusebius, superintending the scribe of the Vatican when he was copying a part of Scripture in which Eusebius felt a very special interest, should interfere and order the omission of the verses to which he has recorded his antagonism; or again that the scribe, when he was called upon to transcribe the same portion in the Sinaitic manuscript, written, as we know, on even more costly and rare materials, in much larger characters—both points of importance taken in connection with the demand for extreme haste—should save the extra column, and thus, whether consciously or unconsciously, obliterate, so far as the authority of that manuscript extends, all indications of the change.

Of course, all such inferences are open to objection, but let not the two facts be ignored: the fact that Eusebius alone in that age is known to have impugned the authenticity of the verses, and again, that those two manuscripts alone in that age, and with one solitary exception (L), alone in all ages of Christendom, expunge them from their text.

One other point need not detain us long. It is, however, of crucial importance. I have spoken before of the close connection between Origen and the school of which Eusebius was the head, and of his own personal feelings towards that

greatest and most influential expositor and critic, undoubtedly the chief guide of critics until his influence was at once confirmed and overshadowed by that of Chrysostom. As Eusebius is substantially one with Origen in his views touching the criticism of the N. T., so are the readings in the two codices for the most part identical with those in citations in Origen. The reader will find abundant instances in the passages examined in this book—*e.g.* take the decisive instance of the Lord's Prayer in St. Luke's Gospel. Origen alone among early Fathers vouches for the omission of nearly one half the clauses which we have examined above, p. 85 seq. —important clauses in every respect: ℵ and B, followed by their constant satellite, alone among ancient MSS. obliterate all traces of their existence from their text. It is, however, as I said, needless to dwell upon this. The fact of the close accordance of the text of the Vatican Codex with that presented by Origen, was recognized long since. Griesbach in his valuable work, the 'Symbolæ Criticæ,' established this fact and illustrated it by a copious series of quotations. That work formed, indeed, the basis of the system, afterwards elaborated by Lachmann, which was adopted by the generality of German critics, notwithstanding the strong warning of Reiche quoted in the first pages of this essay, and which is now presented to the English reader in a complete, able, and highly technical form in the 'Introduction' of Westcott and Hort.

Take the fact simply as a fact. It proves an entire identity of critical position in Eusebius and in the Vatican manuscript, which in this respect coincides with the Sinaitic; and it completes the series of strong and certainly independent arguments, by which I have attempted to show that both manuscripts were written at Cæsarea, in compliance with an imperial mandate, and under the vigilant superintendence of the Bishop.

To this identification of both manuscripts with those sent

by Eusebius to the Emperor, two objections, the only ones of any importance, as it seems to me, have to be considered.

The first refers to the form of the manuscripts; but it applies to one only, B. Eusebius states that those which he forwarded were τρισσά and τετρασσά; and Tischendorf, following Valesius, explains these terms to be equivalent to the Latin "terniones" and "quaterniones," *i.e.* in sheets folded three or four times, whereas Codex B consists of sheets fivefold, which in Latin he calls "quiniones." I must observe that in that case no ordinal corresponding to τρισσά and τετρασσά is found in Greek, derived from the cardinal πέντε. This objection is met by the explanation suggested in my note on page 162: namely, that Eusebius referred to the most prominent characteristic of these manuscripts, one in fact which is peculiar to them. They are written in triple and quadruple columns, three on each page of B, four on each page of ℵ. If, however, this explanation were rejected, I should still argue that the Sinaitic Codex, which agrees in every respect with the description of Eusebius, which is larger in size, nobler in its character, and more costly in materials, was sent to Constantinople; and that B, which, as we have seen, was written before the other, may have been kept back by Eusebius, who of course needed a complete copy for the use of his own metropolitan Church. Under what circumstances that codex found its way to Rome,* is of course wholly uncertain; probably at an early period and at a time when communications between the Churches of Eastern and Western Christendom were frequent, in fact uninterrupted. In any case we may maintain the conclusion to which we have been driven, that the two manuscripts are but variants of one re-

* Dr. Hort indeed surmises that B and probably ℵ also were written at Rome: see his 'Introduction,' pp. 266–7. I fail to see the force of his arguments; to me the indications or evidences of Eastern origin appear conclusive.

cension, absolutely contemporaneous, with the same pervading characteristics of defect or excellence.

The other objection is of a more serious character. Dr. Hort, a high authority especially on such a point, holds that the readings, and especially the classification of the several books of the New Testament, differ substantially from those maintained by Eusebius.* As for the readings, I should be disposed to question the fact, or the significance of the fact, so far as it can be established. The variations in the two manuscripts, which, it must be remembered, Dr. Hort admits to have been in part written by the same scribe, prove how little importance the writer or editor attached to readings which do not materially modify the sense of statements touching on central doctrines; certainly they show how little care was bestowed upon that part of the work. So far as I have examined the citations of Eusebius, and compared them with the manuscripts, they fall under this category, and if this be generally the case, that objection is disposed of. As to the other point, the classification of the books of the New Testament into authentic and universally received, and *ἀντιλεγόμενα* or even *νόθα*, Tischendorf had already met it by anticipation, and in a way which seems to me entirely satisfactory. He observes that Eusebius had a choice between two alternatives: he might either admit into his revised text those books only which were universally received, and which he held to be undoubtedly authentic; or, on the other hand, he might take all those which were received as genuine by the principal Churches of Christendom. The first course would, as Tischendorf observes, imply great arrogance in the critic, and give great offence. I may add that it would have argued a want of discretion, utterly alien to the courtier's habit of mind, to cast

* See his 'Introduction,' p. 74.

such an opprobrium upon portions of Scripture with which Constantine and the ecclesiastics by whom he was surrounded had been long familiar; it would have boded ill for the success of the Eusebian recension, had the Emperor received from him copies of the Scriptures from which those books were altogether absent, or were marked as of questionable or more than questionable authenticity. It is also observed, truly and forcibly, by Tischendorf, that Eusebius does not hesitate to quote and to speak in terms of great reverence of books which in the passage here alluded to he classes as *antilegomena.**

I venture, then, to assume as absolutely proved the following propositions:

(*a*) The two manuscripts were written at the same time and under the same general superintendence.

(*b*) That time coincided with the period at which Eusebius executed the commission of Constantine.

(*c*) The costliness and beauty of the materials used in both manuscripts, more especially in the Sinaitic MS., taken into combination with the care and grace of the handwriting, can scarcely be accounted for under any ordinary circumstances, while the unquestionable indications of haste and even carelessness in readings of secondary, nay some of primary importance, are without parallel in manuscripts at all rivalling these in the estimation of critics.

And if not absolutely proved, I hold it to be established as in the highest degree probable, that Eusebius was the superintendent; and that we have in these two manuscripts the only extant memorials of his recension.

---

* See Tischendorf's 'Nov. Test. Sinaiticum,' Proll. p. xxxii. seq. He winds up with a remark which completely disposes of Dr. Hort's objection: "Quæ si recte disputata sunt, exemplar Sinaiticum ad normam Eusebii egregie conformatum videtur."

SECTION VI.

The Codex Alexandrinus.

We pass from the consideration of the two manuscripts ℵ, B, to that of the Alexandrian Codex, which unquestionably comes nearest to them in antiquity; we have to examine the probable date of its production, and the relations in which it stands to those manuscripts, and to other documents which give us any real insight into the condition of the text of the New Testament in different quarters of primitive Christendom.

The date may be fixed with some degree of certainty between two limits. (1) It must have been written some years after the Vatican Codex. (2) It could scarcely have been written for public use in the Church—a use to which it was undoubtedly destined—long after the promulgation or general reception of the 59th Canon of the Laodicean Council, about A.D. 367.

(1) The first point need not be discussed at length. All critics accustomed to note and qualified to estimate external indications of the date of manuscripts, agree that the style of calligraphy and other sure criteria mark a time not far distant from, but certainly some years later than, that assigned to the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices. But the length of the interval is not so easily decided. It must be remembered that contemporary or nearly contemporary scribes in different countries, writing under different circumstances and under different superintendence, adopted peculiarities in the form of some letters and in their general style which might easily

mislead even a practised inquirer and induce him to assign their writings to a much later age than that to which they really belonged. I may be allowed to notice a very curious exemplification of this peculiarity. The charter of Edward the Confessor which endows the Cathedral of Exeter with the principal part of its landed property, is still retained as one of the most precious documents belonging to the cathedral body. It was inspected by Henry III., and its authenticity was unquestioned until some fifty years ago, when Dr. Hickes, an antiquarian of high authority, pointed out that the style of writing, especially the forms of some letters, could not be reconciled with so early a date, having been introduced by Norman penmen after the Conquest. This grave objection was for a time regarded as all but conclusive, until a keen-eyed critic pointed out, and showed the bearings of, the remarkable fact that Edward, who had long before showed his predilection for the Normans, employed Norman writers in preference to Saxon. Thus an argument which at first told heavily against the document became a peculiarly strong evidence of its genuineness.

Applying this argument to the question now before us I infer that while full dependence may be placed upon the sound judgment and careful observation of the critics, it does not follow that an interval of many years, or of even the greater part of a century, elapsed between the production of the two oldest manuscripts and of this, which for years was our most ancient and trustworthy authority for the text of the New Testament.

I venture to maintain that the limits on both sides may be A.D. 380 and A.D. 410, and that the earlier date is more nearly exact.

I observe, to my great satisfaction, that Dr. Hort, to whose keen judgment especial weight must be assigned, and who

certainly in this case was not biassed by any undue estimate of the authority of this manuscript, holds that a few years may suffice to account for internal or external indications.

This however I regard as certain. Whatever may have been the interval, it could not have been less than the time which intervened between the predominance of Arianism, say A.D. 330, and the restoration of Athanasius to his see, some years before the death of Constantine. Until indeed the permanent restoration of the old Catholic faith and ecclesiastical system was completed, no such manuscript was likely to be produced at Alexandria, or in any part of Egypt. The manuscript is not such a one as a monastery would cause to be written for its own use. Manuscripts carefully written are not uncommon, but they are limited, invariably as I believe, to some portions of Scripture. The production of a complete manuscript of the whole Bible, written in large uncials, on parchment or vellum of the finest and most costly kind, can only be accounted for by its being needed for a metropolitan Church, and at a time when the Archbishop of Alexandria had leisure and means and full opportunity for getting such a work executed. The latter years of Athanasius himself were too much disturbed by the violence and craft of his opponents, and his own mind too much occupied by incessant controversies, to permit the otherwise probable conjecture that he was the editor or the superintendent of these manuscripts. I should rather say that the earliest date at which such manuscripts were likely to be prepared in Egypt was A.D. 380. Valens died A.D. 378; then the extreme pressure of Arianism ceased, but the Arian Lucius, who was obtruded upon the see of Alexandria after the death of St. Athanasius, was finally expelled after the accession of Theodosius in 379. The decree in which that emperor formally recognized Peter as the successor of Athana-

sius was issued in February 380.* That the MS. was written at or about that time, at the very latest before the end of the first decennium of the fifth century, appears to me by far the most probable inference to be drawn from admitted facts.

(2) With regard to the argument drawn from the decree of the Council of Laodicea I have to call attention to these facts. In that council, for the first time, the distinction, which had hitherto been but partially observed, between canonical books received as of apostolic authority by Christendom, and edifying works produced by writers fully entitled to the reverence of the Church, was strictly defined and authoritatively declared. Before the promulgation of that decree the Epistle of St. Clement and other works, such as the spurious Epistle of Barnabas and the 'Shepherd of Hermas,' were read in the public services of many churches. Hence in the Sinaitic Codex the only extant Greek text of part of the 'Shepherd of Hermas,' and the epistle so called of Barnabas, are subjoined to the canonical books, a fact which is justly regarded as decisive proof of its antiquity. But by the 59th Canon of Laodicea the public reading of all such writings was formally and absolutely prohibited. †

Now the Alexandrian manuscript, as is well known, subjoins the first Epistle of St. Clement of Rome to the canonical books, and places it in the index without any mark of distinction. It may be assumed therefore that at the time when, and at the place where, that manuscript was written the old custom had not been interrupted. It is possible, indeed probable, that in some Churches, especially in the

* I take this opportunity of correcting a serious blunder in my 'Second Letter to the Bishop of London,' p. 69, where I stated that Peter was the immediate *predecessor* of Athanasius. I should have said immediate *successor*.

† The 60th canon gives a complete list of canonical books, in exact accordance with the Alexandrian Codex both as regards number and order.

Church of Corinth, the venerable and universally accepted work of the apostolic Clement continued to be read for ages; and had the manuscript been written in Achaia, no argument could have been fairly drawn from its retention, although even in that case a mark of distinction between it and other canonical books was not likely at a late date to have been absent. But that in Alexandria, at a time of vehement controversy, under bishops who were conspicuous for fiery zeal, not to say bitter intolerance, such a system should have been continued, in face of a formal decree of the Church, appears to me incredible. I have therefore no hesitation in assigning the date, as approximately certain, to the latter part of the fourth, at the latest to the first decennium of the fifth century.

But of this too we may feel tolerably certain. The text of a manuscript produced at that age and under these circumstances would present unmistakeable characteristics. In the first place it would in all probability differ from the Eusebian recension in one respect. It would bear no trace of extreme haste and consequent carelessness. Omissions would therefore disappear, except to the extent in which they were borne out by the authority of ancient and generally received documents.

This characteristic stands out prominently in the Alexandrian manuscript. Look through the long list of omissions on the preceding pages, or, if any doubt remains, compare the authorities in Tischendorf's eighth edition, for the omission on the one side, for the retention on the other, of the enormous number of passages marked as doubtful, or rejected as innovations in the Greek text of the Revised Version, and still more so in that of Westcott and Hort, and you will find, with very rare exceptions, so far as the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke are concerned, that ℵ and B are for omission, A for retention.

Now this is of the highest importance. It constitutes, as we have seen, one main argument on which the revising critics rely: on the other side it supplies an argument, in my opinion of far greater force, in favour of the recension which preserves the integrity of Holy Scripture in passages of transcendent interest. This is the more striking, inasmuch as in some of the very gravest cases the testimony of this manuscript is supported by the citations of Fathers of the highest authority. Thus St. Athanasius cites, among others, the following passages: the first great word on the cross; and the statement in Luke xxiv. 40—marked as doubtful in the Revised Version—that our Saviour showed His hands and His feet to the disciples, a citation the more valuable inasmuch as St. Athanasius adduces it as a formal and decisive proof of the reality of our Lord's bodily existence and as subversive of the Manichæan heterodoxy. He would certainly not have ventured to adduce that text had he entertained any doubt as to its genuineness, or had he known that his opponents could reject it on tenable grounds.*

There is perhaps no point upon which Dr. Hort has bestowed more pains than the question as to the character and bearings of this feature in Western manuscripts. I shall have occasion presently to consider his ingenious argument founded on the assumption that what I call restorations, what he calls interpolations, are simply instances of "conflate

---

* I quote the passage as one of great interest. Καὶ τοῦτο (the humanity derived from Mary) οὐκ ἄν τις ἀμφιβάλοι μνησθεὶς ὧν ἔγραψεν ὁ Λουκᾶς· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν, δοκούντων τινῶν μὴ ἐν τῷ ἐκ Μαρίας σώματι βλέπειν τὸν Κύριον, ἀλλὰ ἀντὶ τούτου πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν, ἔλεγεν Ἴδετε τὰς χεῖράς μου, καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου, καὶ τοὺς τύπους τῶν ἥλων, ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτός. Ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει, καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα. Καὶ τοῦτο εἰπών, ἐπεδείξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας. Ad Epictetum, Cor. Ep. Epistola, § 7, p. 906 D, ed. Bened.

readings." Without anticipating the general argument, I must here remark that even were Dr. Hort's theory accepted, it would not support the innovations to which the most serious importance must be attached. The strongest cases are cases of omission. The manuscripts which omit the most striking details in the history of our Lord's sufferings, His death, and, I must add, His resurrection, stand in a diametrically opposite position—I must be allowed to say a far inferior position—to those which retain those details in a form attested both by ancient Versions and by the most ancient and most trustworthy Fathers of the Church.

If we compare one by one the passages in which the Alexandrian and the two other manuscripts are at variance—passages, be it noted, occurring most frequently in the second and third Gospels—with more ancient authorities, or again with the highest authorities of the same age, or of the age immediately preceding, it will be found in the great majority of instances that their evidence preponderates in favour of the former. I cite with peculiar satisfaction the statement of Dr. Hort, Introd. p. 152, that the Alexandrian Codex represents most fairly the text commonly occurring in citations by the Greek Fathers of the fourth century. Now when we consider who those Fathers were, that they comprise nearly all the greatest names in primitive Christendom, the learned and acute Basil, the profound theologian Gregory of Nazianzus, the divines of Asia Minor, of Palestine, of Syria, of Egypt, with Athanasius at their head, I could scarcely desire a stronger proof of excellence. For my own part it would need very strong and substantial evidence to induce me to doubt the genuineness of a text so supported, or to admit the superiority of a text ignored or expressly contradicted by such authorities.

But, as we have seen, the harmony between Origen and

the Vatican Codex is held to outweigh that consideration. To this there are two replies: first, that in some points of crucial importance Origen goes against the readings in that codex,* and that in others where all support is needed he does not supply it. It is inferred indeed† that Eusebius may have learned from Origen to distrust the evidence for the integrity of St. Mark's Gospel, but no passage is adduced from Origen's extant writings in support of that inference, which rests chiefly on the ground that Eusebius recognized in Origen his master: and to keep to my main point, I will ask the reader to look at the authorities which favour the old reading or the innovations respectively in the passages previously examined, and see how slight a claim the Revisers have to the support of Origen.

Here again I must be pardoned for repeating a statement which the reader may have noticed above. I mean that the divergences between the Alexandrian and the Vatican MSS. occur for the most part in the synoptical Gospels. In the Acts and the Epistles by far the greater number of alterations in the Greek text adopted by the Revisers are supported by A as well as by ℵ and B. Westcott and Hort indeed follow B throughout in every detail, however minute, so closely that slight alterations are made, sufficiently numerous at first sight to indicate a difference of recension; but the substantial identity of the two texts in that part of the New Testament is scarcely open to serious question. I do not for my part doubt that Eusebius, who superintended the one recension, and the Egyptian critic who superintended the other, had one and the same original text for the Acts and Epistles before them: a statement which I would further extend to the later recension of the Memphitic and Sahidic Versions,

* See pp. 29, 96, 99, 109, 111.

† This is suggested by Dean Burgon in his work on the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel.

and to some of the later uncials, which agree in the main with the Vatican Codex, but maintain an independent position in cases of peculiar interest.

For my own part I can scarcely understand the low estimation in which Drs. Westcott and Hort hold the other uncials (with the exception of C, Z, Q, and Δ, of which presently) and the entire mass of cursives. One point is certain: the preponderance of their testimony in all, or in nearly all, the passages here in question, is in favour of A, and the MSS. which come nearest to it (*sc.* E, F, G, M), and against ℵ, B, L, singly or in combination. Another point can scarcely be denied: those cursives, between 400 and 500 in number for the Gospels, represent the text, substantially identical, used in all quarters of Christendom from the eighth century down to the introduction of printing.

I very much doubt whether a good cursive manuscript, such as that used by the compilers and revisers of the Old Textus Receptus,* does not present a sound, fairly accurate, and trustworthy text, not inferior to that of the later uncials, equal in many respects to the Alexandrian, and far superior in all respects to the very ancient Western Codex D. I venture further to maintain, so far as regards the mutilated and corrupted passages which I have dealt with in this essay, that such cursives, when virtually unanimous, especially when supported by good uncials, are much to be preferred to the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices.

For the expression of this opinion I shall of course incur the charge of singular obstinacy, or blind prejudice. I can only say that it is an opinion gradually formed, reluctantly entertained, and in the issue forced upon me by repeated examination of the very numerous and all-important statements disfigured, mutilated, or obliterated, in the two oldest

* See Scrivener, 'Introduction,' p. 192 seq.

manuscripts, but retained with singular unanimity in the great mass of cursives.

One other point I must notice in reference to the Alexandrian Codex. It has passages which completely disprove the assumption that its scribe or editor was influenced by doctrinal prepossessions. It has some remarkable omissions, omissions which could not have been adopted by any writer who was solely bent upon maintaining the position of the party of the Church to which he belonged, or who was actuated by any other motive but that of faithfulness to his trust. We need only refer to John vii. 53–viii. 11, where A and C agree with ℵ, B, L, T, X, Δ, *i.e.* the uncials of the Eusebian recension and their satellites; and again to the omission of the great trinitarian text, 1 John v. 7, 8. Their authority indeed decides the question, if not of genuineness, yet of the non-existence of that passage in the text known to the critics and writers of manuscripts in the fourth century.* The omission of this passage is the more remarkable, inasmuch as the Georgian Version has clear traces of its existence in the eighth century, and therefore probably at a still earlier period. However that may be, the omission proves the point with which we are more specially concerned, the independent value of this manuscript. I do not refer to the *vexata quæstio* as to the reading θεός or ὅς in 1 Tim. iii. 16; I agree with Dean Burgon that it is a question which cannot be settled by reference to our manuscript in its present condition; but I must observe that the earnest and ineffectual efforts of controversialists on both sides to appropriate its authority prove the high and very general, not to say universal, estimation in which it is held by critics. Not less conclusive would be the argument for more than imparti-

* We must never forget that it is one thing to show that a reading was common or rare in the fourth century, another to conclude that it rests upon apostolic authority or is destitute of it.

ality, for at least a tendency in the opposite direction, were Dr. Vance Smith's statement * borne out that the punctuation by the first hand in this manuscript justifies the very painful and offensive note on Romans ix. 5 in the margin of the Revised Version. That statement, I believe, is not verified or likely to be verified; but the simple fact that it is advanced by a controversialist in Dr. Vance Smith's position corroborates my assertion as to the weight attached by all scholars to the authority of the Alexandrian Codex.

---

* See 'Revised Texts and Margins,' p. 34, note.

SECTION VII.

Theory of a Syrian Recension.

The interval between the production of the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices on the one side, and on the other of the Alexandrian Codex, is, as we have seen, a period of uncertain duration, and yet determinable within certain limits; we may assume that it covers the latter half of the fourth century.

It is admitted on all hands that the text presented in the two older manuscripts differs from that in the latter, each having marked and unmistakeable peculiarities; not however so clearly marked in other portions as in the Gospels, especially in the three commonly called synoptical. It is further admitted that the readings in the Alexandrian manuscript are substantially identical both with the very numerous citations in Chrysostom, and with the text which, as Dr. Hort expressly states, was commonly used by the great divines of the fourth century. He further agrees with those critics—and his opinion is confirmed by the examination of disputed passages—who hold that the great majority of the later uncials, and the great mass of the cursives of all ages, present a text evidently founded on the same documents, and presenting the same general characteristics. On the other hand, it is not denied—great stress indeed is laid upon the fact—that many peculiar readings of the older manuscripts are found in the extant writings of Origen, and it may be fairly assumed that the text which that Father adopted was the same which formed the basis of what I have called the Eusebian recension.

So far we have positive data, facts patent on the face of existing documents, and confirmed by historical records.

I must however be permitted here to observe that the agreement, which Dr. Hort recognizes, between the text of the Alexandrian Codex and all other authorities from the early part of the fourth century downwards, can be proved also to exist between that text and the majority of the earliest and best Fathers of the Greek-speaking Church, if not in all points, certainly so far as regards the points specially dealt with in the preceding inquiry. The reader has but to cast his eye over the long list of omissions and innovations in the three Gospels, or the classification in pp. 136–141, to come to the conclusion that, if the authorities are correctly stated—they are given by Tischendorf—they cast their weight into the opposite balance. It is not too much to say that in nine passages out of ten—nay, to go further, in every passage of vital importance as regards the integrity of Holy Scripture, the veracity of the sacred writers, and the records of our Lord's sayings—nearly all ancient Versions, and with very few exceptions all ancient Fathers, support the readings rejected by the Revisers.

I have no hesitation in maintaining that if we take the text, nearly a continuous one, which is presented in the voluminous writings of Chrysostom—among the Fathers by far the soundest, most accurate, and judicious expositor of the New Testament—we shall have an entirely trustworthy witness to the mind of Christendom, so far as regards all crucial points, not merely in his own time, but in all preceding times. The differences between that text and the singularly divergent readings in the early Latin Versions and Fathers, which are classified by Dr. Hort as Western, and those which, independently of Codex B, are found in writers and documents which may be termed Origenistic, or Alexandrian, are, with few exceptions, of very subordinate

importance: they affect the style, the tone, the manner of the various writers, but seldom if ever touch central facts or central doctrines in the New Testament. So far as those facts and doctrines are concerned, I claim for our Received Text, in contradistinction from that presented by the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts—substantially identical with that of the Revisers—the general consensus not only of the later authorities, as conceded by Dr. Hort, but of those to which the greatest weight is attached by all critics, in all quarters of primitive Christianity.

But we have now to consider the most characteristic point in Dr. Hort's 'Introduction.' At a time which must certainly be within the interval between the two classes of MSS., and in a quarter of Christendom distinctly marked by the presence and influence of certain great teachers of the Church, it is assumed, as a fact proved by internal evidence, by an exhaustive examination of all existing documents, that a new recension of the Scriptures, especially of the New Testament, was produced, and Dr. Hort assumes that the recension was completed by 350 or thereabouts (p. 137); and, as it would seem, that new recension is held to have been at once accepted by all the Churches of the East, at least by all the great representatives of those Churches, in the same century, apparently at the same part of the same century, which witnessed its completion.

I will however quote Dr. Hort's own words (see his 'Introduction,' § 185, p. 132 seq.):

"The Syrian text, to which the order of time now brings us back, is the chief monument of a new period of textual history. Whatever petty and local mixture may have previously taken place within limited areas, the great lines of transmission had been to all appearance exclusively divergent. Now however the three great lines were brought together, and made to contribute to the formation of a new

text different from all. The Syrian text must in fact be the result of a 'recension' in the proper sense of the word, a work of attempted criticism, performed deliberately by editors and not merely by scribes."

The internal "evidences" by which Dr. Hort supports this theory are stated fully in that 'Introduction.' They have evidently convinced or silenced the members of the Revising Company whose combined influence might have been relied upon as sufficient to counteract tendencies to innovation, if not in minor matters, such, for instance, as Dr. Hort describes as "verbal transposition of adopted readings," yet in all passages which affect the substantial integrity of Holy Writ, and specially our Lord's own utterances.

To deal with these alleged evidences as minutely as Dr. Hort, would require years of study, and very special qualifications, to which I make no pretension;* but so far as regards the only points with which I am now concerned, I feel confident that the internal as well as external evidence tells in the opposite direction. I do not fear that the readings in which A is supported by old Versions, early Fathers, and a great majority of independent manuscripts, will come under Dr. Hort's highly technical description of his "Syrian text," either as "interfusion of adjustments of existing materials with a distinctly innovative process," or as "assimilative or other interpolations of fresh matter." Neither these, nor any other statements occurring frequently throughout his 'Introduction,' apply to those passages which occupy the foremost place in this inquiry.

But I must ask serious attention to the following considerations.

The "recension" of which Dr. Hort speaks, had it been

---

* Since these words were written an exhaustive and singularly able article has been published in the *Quarterly Review*, April 1882.

executed at all in the manner which he intimates, would be a historical fact of signal, I may say unparalleled, importance in the development of textual criticism. Editors of known character, eminent for learning, ability, and soundness in the faith, holding positions which secured to them commanding influence, must have combined to produce what Dr. Hort designates as "a new text different from all" which had previously been received in any quarter of Christendom.

Those editors must not only have produced such a text, but procured its transcription in numbers of manuscripts, sufficient to take possession of the minds of Churchmen not only in Syria and Palestine—Antioch being assumed to be the head-quarters of the new recension—but in the Churches of Asia Minor on the one side, presided over by the greatest divines of the early Church, such as Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus; and on the other side, of Alexandria, where the Church, after the death of Athanasius, was under the influence of prelates more or less antagonistic to the schools of thought represented by those great names, and still more so to that which, under the guidance of Chrysostom, within a few years became the most permanently influential in Eastern Christendom.

At what place, at what time, can it be probably conjectured that such a recension could have been undertaken? Who were the persons, which were the Churches, that could claim and actually vindicate for their work such authority?

This we must remember. A transaction of such transcendent importance must have left some traces, some record, more or less distinct, of its proceedings; some great manuscripts, or body of manuscripts, must have been recognized in all controversies as representing the results of that authoritative "Recension." Were we indeed dealing with some very early period it might have been plausibly assumed that such a transaction might have escaped notice, or have been passed

over as of slight historical importance, not bearing upon the external organization of the Church, or upon controversies which occupied almost exclusively the minds of its chief representatives. But the age and portion of Christendom in question is especially remarkable for the fulness and minuteness of information supplied in voluminous writings touching every point which could interest the minds of churchmen. In fact, it may be safely affirmed that until we come to the period of modern historical literature, there is no period at which all movements of the Christian world are presented to our minds with equal vividness and completeness. For the first time in the history of Christendom, an unbroken series of letters between Basil and all his great contemporaries, supplemented by writings of every description, especially by controversial writings in which the exact bearing and accepted authenticity of every scriptural text involving points of doctrine or ecclesiastical order underwent the most searching investigation, give us a complete survey of the inner life and outward proceedings of the Church; a flood of light especially is thrown upon those quarters and that age at which Dr. Hort holds that this recension was completed.

Is any trace, any minute trace, of such a recension to be found? Had it existed, it would not have escaped the notice of men so learned, so keen-sighted, and so deeply interested in the maintenance of their hypothesis. I venture to affirm that no indication, however slight, is adducible from the writings of contemporary divines, or, to speak broadly, of any ancient author.

On the contrary, I will venture to affirm, and I will ask the learned reader to inquire whether the affirmation can be refuted, that we have abundant indications, not to say proofs, that no such recension could have been contemplated, much less executed, at that period.

We have before us every kind of writing by which we can ascertain the feelings of the Fathers of that century touching the text of the New Testament. Now I say deliberately, with a full sense of the hazardous character of a sweeping negative assertion, that neither the great Cappadocian, nor the Alexandrian, nor the Syrian, nor the Palestinian divines evince any consciousness that a change had passed over the great documents to which they appealed incessantly, either within their own times, or indeed at any time with which they were specially concerned and about which they had ample opportunity of forming a judgment. They quote passages occasionally in which the true reading was matter of discussion; they deal freely with arguments for or against the genuineness of whole books or portions of books; biblical criticism occupied their minds pretty nearly to the same extent as scriptural exegesis. It is evident that each of the lines of transmission to which Dr. Hort frequently refers, under the designation of Western and Alexandrian, was familiar to the divines of that age, the one to the masters of the East, the other to such men as Hilary and Ambrose. But one thing is certain. None of them appealed to any late authoritative judgment of the Church, of any special Church, to any recension of editors recognized as competent, and as witnesses of that judgment. Had it been favourable or unfavourable to their own cause, it is impossible that it should not have been alleged as an authority, or controverted as insufficient. I cannot but conclude that so far from its existence being shown to be probable, its non-existence is proved by the total absolute silence of all the writers from whom alone we can draw trustworthy information touching the proceedings of the Church at that period.*

* Dr. Hort, § 190, assumes that the final recension was completed about the year 350: his arguments throughout apply to the complete recension; but he further holds that there was an earlier stage, about the close of the

I would further remark, that although the divines in question evince the utmost earnestness in inquiries touching the statements and bearings of Holy Scripture, they do not appear to have felt that between what Dr. Hort calls the divergent lines of transmission any such antagonism existed

---

third century, and also that "of known names none has a better claim to be associated with the early Syrian revision than Lucianus." This claim he looks upon as finding some *little* support in the statement of Jerome, in his preface to the Gospels, which I have quoted in a preceding section (see page 152). From the facts which I have there alleged it is clear that a recension conducted or influenced by Lucian would have presented characteristics the very reverse of those which Dr. Hort attributes to what he designates as the Syrian recension. It would have agreed substantially with that text which is represented by citations in Origen, and, as Dr. Hort and other critics hold, by the Vatican manuscript. I may here observe that it is not easy to reconcile the different statements of Jerome, who speaks of Lucian at one time as a man of remarkable learning, and tells us that his copies of Scripture were commonly received at Constantinople; whereas in the Epistle to Damasus he speaks of his revision as maintained only by the perverse contention of a few. But whatever explanation may be given of the statements of a Father, conspicuous for instability and perversity, one thing is sure: Lucian could not possibly have inaugurated, or impressed his own character upon, such a recension as that which Dr. Hort describes. I may add that if, as Jerome asserts, the recension of Lucian was used at Constantinople, the fact can only be accounted for by the reception of the Eusebian manuscripts, which, as I have shown above (Section iv.), undoubtedly followed the text adopted by Lucian, as a follower of Origen.

I have to thank a learned Prelate for the following suggestion. "We cannot but contrast the absolute silence with which the Church must have received this hypothetical recension of the Greek text, with the clamour raised for and against the recension of the Latin Version by St. Jerome. This recension, of infinitely less importance, made an enormous sensation, was praised, blamed, talked of, written of, attacked, defended, throughout all Christendom. We are to believe that in the preceding century, at a period of intense excitement, when earnest attention was given to questions touching the faith of Christians, especially a question which touched the very foundations on which all faith rests, a work to which Jerome's was as nothing in fundamental moment was undertaken and accomplished without a syllable being said. The supposition is a manifest absurdity."

as would make an authoritative recension necessary or desirable. They were quite content to quote Origen and his followers on the one hand and his opponents on the other, without impugning their good faith when they differed, without giving up their own independent judgment when these and other authorities were in accord with each other. A recension of the character and influence described by Dr. Hort would have appeared to them, if I am not mistaken, an encroachment upon the liberty of the Church. They would certainly not admit that any editors or any body of editors had the power or the right to impose their own judgment upon their fellow Christians, who had the same materials before them, and many of whom were equally entitled to form and maintain an independent judgment. The schools represented by Basil, by Chrysostom, by Epiphanius, by Cyril of Jerusalem, by Hilary and Ambrose, were neither likely to surrender, nor would they have been justified in surrendering, their convictions to the dictum of a central authority. If, as Dr. Hort admits, upon the whole, the inference drawn from their citations is that those Fathers coincided in the main with the readings of the Alexandrian MS., and of the great majority of later documents, that coincidence, if not conclusive as to the supreme excellence of the codex, is certainly incompatible with the supposition that such a text as that presented by the two older manuscripts had been previously recognized by the highest authorities in the Eastern Church.

For my own part, I am contented with the conviction that the Alexandrian Codex owes its special value and importance to the fact that it does represent far more fully and fairly than ℵ or B, or both conjointly, the text of the New Testament in all those passages which in the East and in the West, in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, Africa, and Italy, were held to be of vital importance; and I reject without

hesitation the notion that it was the outcome of any new recension, such recension being assumed to have been executed in a district which at the time in question was far from being in harmonious union with the Alexandrian Church, to which this manuscript is now generally admitted to have belonged.

SECTION VIII.

The Question of so-called Conflate Readings.

I have said that it was not my intention, in entering upon a subject which involves a great variety of difficult and complex questions, to discuss the highly ingenious theories presented to us in the 'Introduction to Westcott and Hort's Greek Text.' It sufficed for my purpose to bring out some chief results of their system, to show its bearings upon central and fundamental points, and in each particular instance to adduce the attestation of ancient and trustworthy authorities to words, clauses, and statements which were materially affected by the text of the Revised Version, or by the marginal notes—notes which carry with them the weight of a critical judgment, if not adopted by the Revisers, yet deemed by them worthy of special notice.

The question of conflate readings however seems to demand consideration. It may be dealt with separately; its results can be examined on their own merits; and it stands foremost among the grounds on which the two critics maintain the superior purity and excellence of the text presented in the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices, and the interpolated character of the so-called Syrian text—that text which has hitherto been received, and which is now admitted to be supported by the authority of the majority of uncial, and the mass of cursive manuscripts.

It is a great advantage in this part of the discussion that the passages which we have to consider, with one exception, do not affect great doctrines or contested points of historical

significance. Questions as to bias in any direction are not likely to disturb our judgment; and we have before us a careful and elaborate discussion by Dr. Hort, thus feeling assured that no consideration of any importance will be overlooked.

I must first quote Dr. Hort's own account of the matter. After a very ingenious and highly speculative discussion of what he calls "complications of genealogy by mixture"—that is to say, the difficulty of tracing the relations between texts presented in different manuscripts owing to the conscious or unconscious tendency of scribes and editors to adopt readings derived from different sources—Dr. Hort proceeds thus (p. 49): "We have next to inquire what expedient can be employed when mixture has been ascertained * to exist. Evidently no resource can be so helpful, where it can be attained, as the extrication of earlier unmixed texts or portions of texts from the general mass of texts now extant. The clearest evidence for tracing the antecedent factors of mixture in texts is afforded by readings which are themselves mixed, or, as they are sometimes called, 'conflate,' that is, not simple substitutions of the readings of one document for that of another, but combinations of the readings of both documents into a composite whole."

Practically the application of this process of "extrication" issues in the following results.

We have before us one or more manuscripts, or classes of manuscripts, presenting divergent texts, and evidently proceeding from different recensions. In the one case we find comparatively short sentences; words or clauses to which our ear has been accustomed disappear; the question is, whether in this case we have before us an incomplete or

* The word "ascertained" is characteristic; it means that the writer feels certain of it, or has proved it to his own satisfaction.

mutilated text, or one free from interpolations, coming nearest "to the pure unadulterated text as it stood in the autographs of the sacred writers." In the other we have a fuller, apparently more complete, and, to the general reader, a more satisfactory text, but one which, to the critical eye under the influence of the system which Dr. Hort commends to our adoption, bears evident marks of interpolation.

One thing is clear. The decision will not be doubtful in any case, if it depends upon the prepossessions of the inquirer.

The course invariably pursued by Dr. Hort is to reject the readings in the latter alternative, as "conflate." He applies fearlessly a method of so-called extrication to each special case; and infers the comparative lateness, and therefore the untrustworthiness, of the text which presents the double or multiple reading.

This I venture to call a technical and highly hazardous proceeding; but it cannot or ought not to be met by a mere reference to external authorities. On both sides the inquirer must be on his guard against his own tendencies, habits of thought, and previous bias.

It appears to me a truth, so obvious as to be a truism, that each particular case should be examined on its own merits; and further that the following points especially should be taken into consideration.

(1) It is of course possible—I hold it to be more than possible, in some cases certain—that the omission of words or clauses is attributable, not to the purity, but to the characteristic brevity of the document in which it occurs; in some cases it may be, and probably is, owing simply to the negligence or recklessness of a hasty transcriber.

Dr. Hort, so far as I am aware, stands alone in denying that the Vatican Codex, in this respect on the same footing as the Sinaitic, is conspicuous for omissions, so much so that

the critic quoted by Dr. Scrivener ('Introduction,' p. 108) calls that text an "abbreviated Gospel." Such omissions, however they may be accounted for, occur most frequently in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, from which the instances here to be examined are taken.

(2) The internal evidence in every case demands most careful and impartial investigation. Among such evidences, the very foremost is that which is derived from a study of the general style of the writer—his *usus scribendi* both as regards form and matter. We have to inquire whether it is probable or not, judging from other passages, that he would supply a detail, which might be passed over as superfluous or indifferent by a careless transcriber or a fastidious critic, but which adds vividness to the narrative, or, what is far more important, impresses more forcibly the spiritual significance of the words or transactions in question. Again, it may be ascertained whether, in passages which suggest association with old religious forms, the writer is in the habit of employing Hebraisms, especially the most characteristic feature of Hebrew composition, namely, parallelisms, or repetitions of a leading thought, varying slightly in form but identical in substance, intended and calculated to give full and adequate expression to religious feelings.

Other kinds of evidence, external and internal, will be recognized as necessary or useful; but these will suffice for my immediate purpose.

The first passage is discussed with great care and at considerable length, by Dr. Hort, pp. 95–99.

(*a*) Mark vi. 33.—We read in the Authorized Version, "And [the people] outwent them, and came together unto him."

For the reading which underlies this statement we have the authority (1) of all uncials, except ℵ, B, D, L, Δ; (2) of the great mass of cursives; (3) of the Syriac Peshito and Æthiopic Versions.

The account is clear and graphic. St. Mark, with his usual attention to details, with what Dr. Hort calls his "characteristic abundance of detail," has before his own mind and sets vividly before our minds two facts: (1) that the multitude ran on rapidly in advance of the boat which bore our Lord and His disciples away from the place where they had met; and (2) that on arriving at the opposite shore, where the disembarkation would take place, they came together to meet Him. In the next verse, St. Mark, as usual, calls our attention to this act—"He came out," or came forth from the ship, and found the multitudes there awaiting Him.*

We have thus a complete series of acts—the rapid pursuit of the people, the attainment of their object, and the effect of their zealous search; the people were rewarded by His compassion, He "taught them many things," and afterwards wrought a miracle of transcendent significance and importance.

But on looking at the ancient texts we find that manuscripts representing the Western recension, D, 28, *b*, omit the first clause, and in the second have a variant, *αὐτοῦ* for *πρὸς αὐτόν*, preserving the leading word *συνῆλθον*, but entirely perverting the sense: the one is a point of importance as an attestation to the true reading, the other as an instance of the carelessness and want of perception which characterize the Codex Bezæ.

On the other hand B, with ℵ, followed as usual by L and Δ, omit the second clause. If the editor or copyist had *αὐτοῦ* before him, he must of course have been struck by its

* Dr. Hort introduces an utterly alien point; assuming that "He 'came out' of His retirement in some sequestered nook to meet them," p. 99. This interpolation seriously affects the narrative. Of course the multitude could not have come together to Him had He been in such retirement; on the other hand, they would naturally come together at the place where the boat, which they doubtless kept in sight, reached the shore.

unsuitableness and therefore might think fit to omit the clause altogether. In fact whichever reading he found, whether *αὐτοῦ* or *πρὸς αὐτόν*, it is just such a clause as we might expect to miss in a recension which abounds in abbreviated statements. In such a case as this a clear-headed editor might of course agree with our modern critic that the people would needs do what they proposed, and that a statement to that effect was superfluous.

The arguments adduced by Dr. Hort in his elaborate examination of this passage leave us in this position: we have to choose between two alternatives, careless or fastidious omission on the one side, or characteristic fulness of detail on the other. That I hold the latter to be far more probable and satisfactory will of course lay me open to a charge that I too, in common with the great majority of ancient editors, "am under the influence of an impulse to omit no recorded matter." See 'Introduction,' p. 97. I can only say that I accept that imputation in every case where the "recorded matter" is supported by good authority; where it harmonizes with the general style of the recorder; especially where, as in this instance, it gives a more complete and graphic picture of proceedings connected with a memorable incident in our Lord's life.

May I be pardoned for expressing my deep regret that the Revising Committee in this and in all similar instances were not under the influence of that impulse?

(*b*) Mark viii. 26.—The old Received Text has *μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς μηδὲ εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ*. This rests on the authority of sixteen uncials, of all cursives except eight, the Syriac, the Vulgate, Æthiopic, and Gothic Versions.

The construction is explained clearly and authoritatively by Winer, "Mr. 8. 26—kann nicht heissen *neque—neque*, sondern das erste *μηδέ* ist *ne-quidem*, das zweite *auch nicht*;" *i.e.* the first *μηδέ* is "not even," the second "neither also." 'Grammatik,' § 55, p. 456, 8th edition.

It is difficult to see why this should cause any objection. The reiteration of the injunction, or rather the addition of a secondary injunction, is quite in accordance with St. Mark's style, but was surely most unlikely to be introduced into the passage by an interpolator. The second clause was evidently struck out by some scribe, or corrector, who argued, like our modern critic, that it was superfluous. That it stood in its present form before the time assumed by Dr. Hort to have been that of a Syrian recension, is proved by the admitted fact that it is supported by the Peshito.

But ℵ, B, L, two cursives, and the Coptic Version omit the last clause altogether.

Therefore it must be discarded, notwithstanding the strange harshness of the construction with what Dr. Hort rightly calls "the peculiar initial μηδέ." It is so "peculiar" that if another instance was adducible it ought to have been adduced. I remember no similar instance.

I feel no hesitation in imputing the omission to the ordinary negligence, or specially to the habit of abbreviation, conspicuous in the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts.

(*c*) Mark ix. 38.—With reference to another case, Mark ix. 38, I will only say that the words omitted by Dr. Hort, but retained even in the Revised Version, are supported by ample authority—by all uncials except ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, by all cursives except twenty; by the best ancient Versions, and in the 'Moralia' ap. Basil. tom. ii. p. 252 A, ed. Ben. The clause ought to be retained as one among many clear instances of St. Mark's characteristic habit of emphatic reiteration. The Apostles dwell upon the fact that the miracle-worker did not belong to their company. St. Mark is careful to bring out that point fully and distinctly, as casting a strong light upon their feelings and upon the directions given to their thoughts by our Lord.

(*d*) Mark ix. 49.—This is followed by a still more serious

omission, for which the Revised Version makes itself responsible. In *v.* 49 the entire clause, "and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt," is rejected; of course in deference to ℵ, B, L, with Δ, and a few cursives of the same recension; of course also against all other MSS., uncial or cursive, and the best ancient Versions. To this point I have already called attention, but I may here be permitted to repeat my statement that, if I am not wholly mistaken as to the significance of the clause, it expressed our Lord's mind on a question of paramount importance, and at a most critical point in His ministry. Whereas the evildoer is doomed to be salted with penal fire, every true and acceptable worshipper, as a living sacrifice, will be salted with the salt—the preserving, sanctifying salt—of the New Covenant; in other words, with the charity which is its essential principle, with which all spiritual life is inseparably bound up. I must express my regret that Dr. Hort and the Revisers should have lent their countenance to the conjecture that this deeply spiritual utterance is a mere interpolation, suggested by a reminiscence of Lev. vii. 13. See above, p. 77 seq.

I must notice very briefly the two passages which follow, taken from St. Luke.

(*e*) Luke ix. 10.—The A. V. has, "And he took them and went aside privately into a desert place belonging to the city called Bethsaida."

This follows the reading of fourteen uncials, all cursives but three, the Peshito Syriac, Æthiopic, Armenian, and Gothic Versions.

Each point appears indispensable to the right understanding of the statement: the *desert place* was needed for the purpose of rest and retirement, the name of Bethsaida to mark the district, with the distinction between the city or town and the place to which our Lord retired.

Yet this is a "conflate reading," according to Dr. Hort,

because *one* ancient MS., B, followed by its late satellites L, X, Ξ, and one cursive, 33, with the Coptic and Sahidic, has only "to a city called Bethsaida:" and other MSS. and Versions have either "a desert place" alone or combined with Bethsaida.

That it is a complete and accurate statement is unquestionable. The only question is whether the varying and incomplete and more or less inaccurate statements in MSS. noticeable for omissions or for negligence, or the great mass of manuscripts, are most likely to have represented St. Luke's account correctly.

(*f*) Luke xi. 54.—The same remarks will apply generally to this passage. The same uncials, fourteen in number, and all cursives but five, with the Vulgate and Syriac, support the Authorized Version, "laying wait for him, and seeking to catch something out of his mouth that they might accuse him."

The Revised Version follows three manuscripts found all but invariably on the side of abbreviation, ℵ, B, L, with the Coptic Version; and condemns the statement of the A. V. in which every word has a distinct and emphatic sense, by the omission of the clauses "and seeking" and "that they might accuse him."

Whether omission or interpolation is the more probable, having regard to St. Luke's style, and the force of the statement as it stands in the A. V., may be left to the reader's judgment. Admitting the ingenuity of Dr. Hort's combinations, I fail to see the cogency of his argument, and cannot but deprecate the course adopted by the Revisers.

(*g*) Luke xii. 18.—The old Textus Receptus has *τὰ γενήματά μου καὶ τὰ ἀγαθά μου*. So sixteen uncials, all cursives but twelve, and the majority of ancient Versions.

But for *γενήματά μου* Dr. Hort has persuaded the Revisers to adopt the reading *τὸν σῖτον*: following $\aleph^a$, B, L, T, X, and a few cursives.

But surely the first and most natural conclusion is that σῖτον, an exceedingly common word, was not unlikely to be substituted by a calligrapher, especially when writing hastily, for γενήματα, a word which does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament in the sense of "fruits of the earth." That γεννήματα (*not* γενήματα) is used frequently in the Septuagint is a fact which sufficiently accounts for its adoption by the Evangelist, and therefore should be regarded as corroborating the evidence for the Received Text; but to scribes and to readers in the fourth century the word σῖτον would be far better known, and might probably be adopted by the scribe or editor in the first place as a useful gloss, and afterwards introduced into the text.

For my part I feel no doubt as to the origin of the change, viz. the carelessness or the officiousness of the transcriber of Codex B.

(*h*) Luke xxiv. 53.—I would now call special attention to the last instance in Dr. Hort's discussion. St. Luke, c. xxiv. 53, after telling us that our Lord ascended into heaven and received the worship of His disciples, who were witnesses of that event,* adds that they were then continually in the temple "praising and blessing God." The word "praising" is rejected without notice from the text of the Revised Version, on grounds to which Dr. Hort refers, but which he deems it unnecessary to discuss.

The authorities for omission are ℵ, B, C^{x}, L. The word is found in all other uncials, in all cursives, and is well attested by ancient Versions.

On the other hand, D, of all MSS. the least trustworthy, keeps αἰνοῦντες and omits εὐλογοῦντες.

The question is a very simple one. Which is the more

* I must refer to p. 125 for a discussion of the omission of the statement that "our Lord was carried up into heaven," as suggested in the margin of the R. V.

probable of the two alternatives, (*a*) that the word was inserted by injudicious scribes, or formed a conflate reading under editorial recension at a time and place for which Dr. Hort must be consulted; or (*b*) that it was actually written by St. Luke? Of course the omission does not materially affect the statement. To modern ears generally, and probably to the ears of a calligrapher, especially to one writing under pressure for time, the statement might seem complete with one word only: an argument, however, which, so far as it goes, is unfavourable to the theory of a conflate reading, omission being far more probable than interpolation.

We have recourse therefore to internal evidence. Here we observe that in details connected with religious observances customary among the Hebrews, St. Luke, whose general style is more classical than that of any other writer in the New Testament, indulges in Hebraisms to a most remarkable extent. Both in the early part of this Gospel, and in the earlier particulars recorded in the Acts, the Hebraistic tone, with its special characteristics of parallelism and repetition, is recognized by all critics as a striking peculiarity. In a passage, therefore, which refers specially to attendance and acts of worship in the Temple—at that time the head-quarters, so to speak, of devotional observances for Hebrew Christians—we might expect such a modification of style as is presented by the old familiar form in this passage.

To this I must add the fact, surely of importance though unnoticed by Dr. Hort, that the combination of the two verbs *αἰνεῖν* and *εὐλογεῖν*, is in strict conformity with Hebrew usage, especially in reference to public devotions and on occasions of special solemnity. Thus in Ps. xxxiii., we read in the LXX. Version, used by St. Luke, *εὐλογήσω τὸν κύριον ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ, διαπαντὸς ἡ αἴνεσις αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ στόματί μου.* Here the reader will observe the word *διαπαντός*, common to the Psalmist and the Evangelist. Other instances will be

supplied by Tromm's Concordance, *e.g.* Ps. lxii. 5, 6, and lxv. 8.

The double expression is in fact emphatic. To *praise* God and to *bless* God present two distinct acts or aspects of worship. The former recognizes His goodness shown in special acts of favour. The second declares His glory and inherent majesty. The two aspects would present themselves with peculiar force to the minds of the disciples after the stupendous manifestation of that goodness and that majesty in the Ascension of the risen Saviour.

The summary statements of Dr. Hort in reference to "conflate readings" give these results.

(1) For the abbreviated form we have "a small handful of uncials, including the two oldest, and a few varying cursives, sometimes wanting."

That is, one recension, which is thus marked as conspicuous for unsupported abbreviations, to whatever cause the fact is to be referred.

(2) For loose inaccurate readings, whatever may be the direction to which they point, we have D (the notorious Codex Bezæ), "and sometimes a few varying cursives, with the rare accession of ℵ or another uncial."

(3) For the third class, or so-called "conflate readings," Dr. Hort ranges "nearly all the later uncials, with two or three of the older, especially A, and nearly all the cursives."

I may adopt this classification in its broad rough outlines: nor should I feel much doubt as to the choice between the first and the third set of authorities which would approve itself generally to impartial students within our own Church. The choice of scholars under the influence of other systems of criticism or religious thought may fall upon the first.

I must however press upon all inquirers the following points.

(1) Dr. Hort agrees, I will not say admits, but is satisfied that the interval between the date of the two older manuscripts ℵ and B, and that of the Alexandrian Codex A, was by no means a long one. I have shown above that it probably coincided with the interval between the predominance of Arianism in the Empire and the restoration of Catholicity, extending from the decennium before the middle to the close of the fourth century.

(2) Still more important is the statement of the same critic, *i.e.* that "A, both in the Gospels and elsewhere, may serve as a fair example of the MSS. that, to judge by patristic quotations, were commonest in the fourth century."

At the risk of repetition I must call special attention to the significance of this statement in its bearings upon the present argument. The fourth century, or, to speak still more exactly, the middle of that century within some very few years, is the time when, according to Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and other critics of high authority, the two manuscripts ℵ and B, and when B according to *all* critics, were written, a point, be it noted, wholly independent of the question at what place or under what recension. So that A, the Alexandrian Codex, the representative, according to Westcott and Hort, of the Syrian recension, actually represents the text which was adopted, and used without the slightest indication of doubt, by the great divines, the masters of early Christian thought in that very century.

I do not think that I can be mistaken in the assumption that with such data, which are not contested, nay which are supported by those two eminent critics, few English Churchmen will hesitate in their choice between the two recensions, or, to speak more accurately, the two sets of authorities. On the one side we find Eusebius, and the two manuscripts which ignore or reject some of the most striking incidents in the life of our Lord, some of the words most specially dear to the

hearts of Christians; on the other side we have the enormous preponderance of MSS. uncial and cursive, the best ancient Versions, and the very greatest names in ancient Christendom, from Irenæus onwards, and, with the solitary exception of Origen,* the long list of glorious Fathers, Athanasius, Basil, the Gregories, including Chrysostom, in whom the critical and exegetical teaching of the Church found its ablest and completest representative.

---

* In some most important passages even Origen is in accordance with these Fathers, *e. g.*, see above, p. 109, and note, p. 191.

SECTION IX.

Answers lately given by Members of the Revising Committee to Charges of unjustifiable Innovations.

The most important publications by Revisers in defence of their proceedings in reference both to the text and the version have been the three letters of the Bishop of Durham published in the *Guardian;* a short pamphlet by the Rev. W. G. Humphry, B.D., published under the direction of the Tract Committee of *S.P.C.K.*, and entitled 'A Word on the Revised Version;' and lastly, a tract published by Macmillan, with this title, 'The Revisers and the Greek Text of the New Testament, by two members of the New Testament Company.'

My reply to the Bishop of Durham's letters, which referred exclusively to the innovation in the last clause of the Lord's Prayer, was published some months ago in the form of a second letter to the Bishop of London, with the heading "Deliver us from evil." An answer to that reply is to be looked for, having been in fact promised by the Bishop of Durham last autumn in a letter to the *Guardian.* Some additional points bearing upon that question will be found in pp. 61, 62 of this treatise. The tract by Mr. Humphry has been referred to in some notes added while these pages were passing through the press.

But the last publication reached me too late to be used in the preceding sections. The points with which it deals demand separate and careful consideration; they are weighty both as regards their subject-matter and as regards the position of the writers, if the statement in the *Times* is correct,

informing us that the "two members" are the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, the Chairman of the Revising Committee, and Archdeacon Palmer. To the former special responsibility for the whole work must needs attach, as the seconder of the original application to Convocation, and as having presided at every meeting from the commencement of the work. Archdeacon Palmer, who joined the Committee long afterwards, is undoubtedly a fitting representative of the scholarship of his own university.

I must first call attention to a fact of very considerable importance which seems to be commonly overlooked. It refers to the distinction between the *conditions* under which the work was entrusted to the Committee, and the *instructions* which the original members of the Committee drew up for their own guidance.

Now these are two entirely distinct points.

The conditions rest upon the authority of Convocation; I have cited them verbatim in the first pages of this treatise. They are precise and distinct; they mark the exact limits within which the members of the Committee were bound to confine their critical and revisional work. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, as I there pointed out, calls them "fundamental resolutions." They directed the Committee to correct *plain and clear errors*, to make no changes that were not *neccessary*.

But "the instructions" to which the Two Revisers refer did not come from Convocation, and were never submitted to that body. They rest wholly upon the authority of the Committee of Revisers appointed by Convocation. They were doubtless intended to bring the "fundamental" resolutions into a practical form; but they cannot be pleaded in defence of any charge brought against the Committee as having exceeded "their instructions," or, as the Two Revisers ought to have stated the charge (p. 32), exceeded the limits fixed by Convocation.

Now it may fairly be alleged on the part of those members of the Revising Company who joined it after the work was commenced, that those instructions were naturally regarded by them as authoritative. It would of course be assumed that they were not intended to contravene or to modify the "fundamental resolutions;" nor should we be surprised if special stress were laid upon the rules cited p. 33, that the Revisers are "to introduce into the text of the Authorized Version as few alterations as possible consistently with faithfulness;" and in respect of the Greek text "to adopt that text for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating." But those *rules* are very different things from the resolutions which they purport to carry out: a fact which would scarcely be inferred from the statements in the Two Revisers' treatise, and of which one of the Revisers might not be fully cognizant, but which, with all deference be it said, the Chairman ought to have kept constantly before his own mind and the minds of his Committee.

I can only apologize for what may appear a somewhat unnecessary repetition on the ground that the confusion between the resolutions of Convocation and the rules and instructions drawn up by the Revisers themselves is common, and likely to be perpetuated by such statements as those which we find confidently advanced in their treatise.*

The next point which calls for attention is the admission that the mode of procedure at the meetings of the Company has been correctly described by Principal Newth in his 'Lectures on Bible Revision,' which were quoted in the *Quarterly Review* of October 1881.

Such a proceeding appeared to me so strange, so certain to result in unsatisfactory decisions, that I fully expected

* Convocation never holds itself responsible for the proceedings of its committees, but only for its own formal resolutions. Great importance is attached to this principle.

the account would be corrected, or that some explanation would be given which might remove the very unpleasant impression. As it now stands, we learn on the highest authority that at each meeting the Chairman called upon the two representatives of schools of textual criticism to allege reasons for the retention of the old text or for the substitution of a new text. Dr. Scrivener and Dr. Hort were unanimously accepted as the best authorities on the two sides. When they had stated their reasons, the question was put to the vote, and the decision of the majority was given, as the Two Revisers state (p. 34), "in most cases at the First Revision;" but when such questions were "reopened at the Second Revision," a majority of two thirds was required "to sustain decisions which at the First Revision had been carried by a simple majority."

Now when we bear in mind the facts—that Dr. Scrivener was the only member of the Company who had previously produced any considerable works in textual criticism; that nearly six thousand changes in the Greek text* were adopted finally by the Revisers; that in nearly every weighty text which has been examined as affecting the records of our Lord's words and acts, we have certain proofs of that critic's judgment being adverse to the final decision; and that a very long discussion would be required to state and to examine the authorities on either side, especially since the scholars on the Committee, eminent as they might be for other departments of theological literature, were confessedly inexperienced in this most technical and embarrassing of all departments; we cannot but reaffirm our conclusion that a less scientific, less satisfactory process could not easily be devised.

We ask, how can the results which stand before us in the new Greek text be accounted for? How did it come to pass

* 5788 according to Dr. Scrivener's notes.

that Dr. Scrivener, the solitary representative of conservative criticism, was systematically outvoted; outvoted at least to the extent indicated in our detailed examination of the most important texts?

The answer to this question involves several points to be considered presently. Here I may at once say that there appear to be good grounds for the very general impression that Dr. Hort was supported in most cases by members of the Committee who were strongly prepossessed in favour of his system, and who constituted a very large proportion of the average attendants; and that the decision arrived at was generally a logical conclusion from the adoption of the general principles advocated in his 'Introduction.'*

For my own part, I venture to repeat my own words, that in every case where Dr. Scrivener and Dr. Hort arrived at diametrically opposite conclusions, those members of the Committee who had not previously made a special study of textual criticism would have done well to abstain from voting at all. "The critical experience that had been slowly and surely won," to use the Two Revisers' words, was of course inapplicable to the great mass of questions which were settled, as we are told, finally at the earlier meetings; when acquired, such experience could scarcely be accepted as so sure as to justify a final vote on some of the most difficult and intricate questions which have been decided by the Committee.

Surely the very fact of an irreconcileable difference between those representatives of two schools of criticism should have been held as conclusive against the rejection of readings maintained by the most experienced and best known scholar in the whole Company, a rejection which implied that they involved plain and clear errors.

---

* See the statements of the 'Two Revisers,' p. 34.

This brings us into contact with another point. It was assumed by the *Quarterly* Reviewer, and on grounds wholly independent of that authority it has been assumed throughout the preceding inquiry, that the influence of Drs. Westcott and Hort was all-powerful with the Revisers, so far as regards the Greek text. The Two Revisers say, p. 31, "The reviewer often speaks as if Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort were responsible for all the results at which the Revisers arrived." I believe that the reviewer, and I know that I, in common with the generality of outsiders, are far from asserting that of *all* the results. For the greater number of results, I must further say, for the most serious results, those two eminent critics are so far responsible that they had adopted them in their own Greek text and defend them strenuously in their 'Introduction.' Whether they are responsible for the decisions of the Committee is another question; that depends of course upon the extent of their personal influence. That influence was great, and deservedly so, considering that they had devoted more than thirty years of close study to this special subject. We do not of course question the assertion of the Two Revisers, who claim (on p. 31) for the whole body, "complete independence in the final determination of the Greek text:" but we scarcely feel that such shifting of responsibility, from persons so well known and so fully competent, to a general committee, is calculated to give us greater confidence in the result.

We cannot, however, but remark that their "complete independence" does not exclude an amount and kind of help which, as stated by the Revisers, amounted to something nearly approaching superintendence or direction. We are told that "these eminent critics did indeed place instalments of their Greek text in the hands of each member of the Company in the manner indicated by Dr. Hort," and on referring to that scholar's own account of the matter we

read, "The Gospels, with a temporary preface of twenty-eight pages, were thus issued in July 1871, the Acts in February 1873, the Catholic Epistles in December 1873, the Pauline Epistles in February 1875, and the Apocalypse in December 1876." It is indeed true, and it has been noticed more than once in this essay, that the "passages" in which the Greek text of the Revisers differs from the results that are to be found in the edition of Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort, "are by no means few" (p. 31); but it is equally true that in nearly all the passages which have been here selected as instances of serious innovation, there is a general and substantial accord.

Passing, however, from this general statement, we have before us the grounds on which the Revisers based all such determinations as we have called in question.

Those grounds may be briefly stated.

The Revisers were convinced, as a body, or as the majority of a body, that the purest, the only thoroughly trustworthy authority for the Greek text, speaking generally, is that supplied by the two oldest manuscripts, the Vatican and the Sinaitic. Upon this part of the question I have already dwelt at great length. I do not find any new grounds for this exclusive preference in the Two Revisers' treatise, apart from their acceptance of the theory of a Pre-syrian text and an authoritative Syrian recension.

But I must protest against their statement that scholars who object to their innovations are biassed by a superstitious reverence for the old Textus Receptus. The *Quarterly* Reviewer needs no defender. He has fully vindicated his own position in an unanswerable article published in the April number, 1882. But speaking on my own behalf, and on behalf of others who hold the same views, I say this: the Textus Receptus is entitled to such preference as is claimed for it, not so much on the ground that it has been generally

accepted by scholars and others for more than three centuries, but because those of its readings which are of supreme importance, so far certainly as the first three Gospels are concerned, have in their favour a decided preponderance of ancient authorities, as compared with the readings of the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts. That Textus Receptus was taken in the first instance from late cursive manuscripts: but its readings are maintained only so far as they agree with the best ancient Versions, with the earliest and best Greek and Latin Fathers, and with the vast majority of uncial and cursive manuscripts.

We have in fact the formal admission that the old Received Text agrees in the main with that used by the Fathers of the fourth and following centuries in the Eastern Churches: especially with the text used by Chrysostom throughout his homilies. This has been previously noticed as a fact recognized by Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort; it is satisfactory to find that it is formally recognized by the two representatives of the Committee of Revision.

The Two Revisers, in p. 28, state the grounds on which the "textual decisions" of the Committee were based. "It was a conviction that the true text was not to be sought in the Textus Receptus, or in the bulk of the cursive manuscripts, or in the late uncials (with or without the support of the Codex Alexandrinus), or in the Fathers who lived after Chrysostom, or in Chrysostom himself and his contemporaries, but in the consentient testimony of the most ancient authorities. That this was the conviction of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, is plain from the character of the texts which they gave to the world. These texts show, beyond controversy, how far they were from regarding the Received Text as a standard, and how high a value they ascribed to the oldest manuscripts, Versions, and Fathers."

I might refer to the preceding sections in this treatise for an answer to this series of statements; but it will be more satisfactory to say a few words upon each point.

The main point is the statement, that the true text was sought by the Revisers in the consentient testimony of the most ancient authorities. But it is precisely on this ground that I have throughout maintained the wrongfulness of the innovations introduced into the Revised Version, so far as they affect leading facts and great words recorded in the first three Gospels. The reader need but look at the passages enumerated in the classification given above, p. 136 seq., to be convinced that so far from resting upon the consentient testimony of ancient manuscripts, Versions, and Fathers, by far the greater number of innovations, including those which give the severest shocks to our minds, are adopted on the authority of two manuscripts, or even of one manuscript, against the distinct testimony of all other manuscripts, uncial and cursive. Those two manuscripts are supported in some instances—in about one third of the passages now in question—by a very small number of uncials and cursives all but invariably belonging to the same school, in other words, to the Eusebian recension.

In some instances they are supported by early Italic, the Vulgate, and the Egyptian Versions; but in the most important of all passages the reading adopted by the Revisers is disproved even by those witnesses, as for instance, in St. Luke's records touching the last scenes of our Lord's Passion, and the whole concluding portion of St. Mark's Gospel, in respect to which, I must be excused for once more stating, that every ancient Version, even those which are seriously mutilated, the Gothic, the Syriac of Cureton, and the Sahidic, give an absolutely unanimous attestation to its existence, and general reception by the Churches of Eastern and Western Christendom.

Nor must I here omit to notice the fact that the term *late uncials* does not apply either to the Alexandrian Codex or to C, D, and other manuscripts which belong either to the latter part of the fourth, or to the fifth and sixth centuries. As I have more than once noticed, Dr. Hort admits that the two oldest manuscripts are separated from A by a very short interval of time, and I have assigned reasons for my belief that they were written under circumstances which seriously affect their testimony, especially in cases of omission. The attestation of the general mass of uncials and of cursives ought not to be disregarded on the mere score of inferior antiquity. They record the tradition of the Churches in every quarter of Christendom for some ten or twelve centuries, and, as Dr. Hort admits, they represent the text used not only by "the Fathers who lived after Chrysostom," but by the Fathers of the fourth century. For my own part the reception of that text by Chrysostom, unless it be decisively rejected by a consensus of earlier Fathers, appears all but conclusive. But so far from being opposed to such a consensus, in every passage which has come under consideration in this treatise, it is in accordance with clear, distinct, unmistakeable quotations of the best ante-Nicene Fathers, especially with the earliest and most important witness to the views and principles of the Churches of Asia Minor, Gaul, and Italy, in the second century, viz. Irenæus, the pupil of Polycarp, who was himself the pupil of St. John. It is also a fact which ought specially to have weighed with critics who profess to follow Griesbach and Lachmann, that in some passages of the highest importance the old reading is found even in Origen and Eusebius.

It would be wrong to jeopardize the text of Holy Writ by an appeal to any single authority or set of authorities; but were we dealing with ordinary writings, were we considering disputed passages in secular or ecclesiastical writers, I

should scarcely hesitate to accept or to propose this challenge:

Prove that any such passage is rejected by the ancient Versions, by distinct quotations of ante-Nicene Fathers, in substantial accordance with the two oldest manuscripts, and I will at once surrender it, if not as spurious, yet as open to serious doubt. On the other hand, if the bulk of uncials, including those nearest in age to ℵ, B, and of cursives, present the reading in the form attested by one or more ante-Nicene Fathers of recognized authority, and by the most ancient and trustworthy Versions, let that reading be regarded as authoritative.

I do not see how such a challenge could be refused, or how it could be met, save by disproof of the citations alleged in support of the old readings.

The Two Revisers, as might be expected, protest against the "charges of textual corruption and depravation made against certain MSS. *c. g.* ℵ, B, C, L." These charges, so far as they have been advanced in this essay, apply, with few exceptions, to omissions, attributed to haste and negligence on the part of the transcriber and editor, and they are supported by most distinct and positive statements of critics to whose authority the Two Revisers assign the very highest importance, such as Scrivener and Tischendorf: see pp. 171–175. Those few exceptions, however, touch questions of signal importance, and in each case present readings repudiated by the highest authorities, ancient and modern. As for the general character of three of those codices—I do not think that C should come under the same category—it is not necessary, nor would it be becoming in me, to express a decided opinion. It is a question which will probably, which certainly ought to, occupy the minds of scholars skilled in textual criticism, but which I venture to assert cannot be settled until that department of theological literature has

made far greater advances. Up to the present I am not aware that in England any scholars except Tregelles, Dr. Scrivener, and Dean Burgon, have produced works which prove or indicate extensive acquaintance with original MSS., with the great mass of uncials and still less of cursives.* In Germany, so far as I am aware, Tischendorf stands alone in that special department. We owe to him the best and most complete account of variants; but years of patient labour, careful examination of all existing documents, and an impartial comparison of their testimony with the citations in ante-Nicene and other Fathers, will be needed to supply materials for a final judgment, which after all may be seriously affected by doctrinal or antidogmatic prepossessions.

I acknowledge that the statement that a company of Revisers, who are described by members of their own body as inexperienced in textual criticism, should have given their votes after a discussion which must in most cases have occupied but little time, considering the total number of hours employed on the 6000 Greek and the 36,000 English alterations, appears to me to savour of temerity: nor can I attach much weight to the statement (p. 30) that "the results at which the Company arrived were communicated in due course to the American Committee, on which there were some textual critics of known eminence." I may be very ignorant, but I confess that I was not at all aware that any American critic had attained to eminence in this special department. Men of learning, great ability, keen and vigorous intellect, America certainly produces, but unless they have enjoyed and used opportunities of long and earnest

* The Two Revisers say, "The number of living scholars in England who have connected their names with the study of the textual criticism of the New Testament is exceedingly small."

study of manuscripts in various countries of Europe, they could scarcely claim to be regarded as competent authorities in regard of the Greek text.

The Two Revisers dwell upon the "constitution" of the Company as a guarantee of impartiality. But the question really is, were the members severally or collectively competent to form a correct judgment? We may admit that "the fancies and predilections of individuals were not able to usurp the place of evidence:" but we may fairly ask whether one or the other of the schools represented severally by Dr. Hort and Dr. Scrivener had not a preponderating influence. Judging by the results, by the excision of texts attested by ancient Versions, ante-Nicene Fathers, and an immense majority of manuscripts, which are retained and admirably defended by Dr. Scrivener, but rejected, or enclosed in brackets, in the edition of Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort, it is hard to resist the impression that the general body of Revisers, at least those who happened to be present when each point was decided, moved altogether in one direction. The Two Revisers point out that the bias in favour of one particular manuscript (ℵ) "is to be traced with unmistakeable clearness" in the last edition of Tischendorf. A bias certainly not less distinct is avowed by Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort in favour of the Vatican Codex. That MS., sometimes alone, generally in accord with the Sinaitic, is responsible for nine tenths of the most striking innovations in the Revised Version. Can it be supposed that the decisions of the general Company, or two thirds of the general Company, were free from that bias? The Two Revisers do not, and cannot, deny the important statement of the *Quarterly* Reviewer's first article (vol. 152, p. 350), that "so intimate proves to be the sympathy between the labours of Drs. Westcott and Hort and those of our Revisionists, that *whatever the former have shut up within double brackets the latter are found to have branded*

with a note of suspicion, conceived invariably in the same terms, viz.: 'some ancient authorities omit.' And further, whatever those editors have rejected from the text these Revisionists have rejected also." Yet, though not a word of this conclusive proof of identity is denied, the Two Revisers actually add a postscript to their pamphlet of a single short page noticing their unexpected anticipation by the third *Quarterly Review* article, with the remark that "in this controversy [between Westcott and Hort and the Reviewer] it is not for us to interfere"—as if Westcott and Hort's theory of Greek revision could be refuted or seriously damaged without cutting the ground from under the Committee of Revisers on the whole of this subject.

The question as to the so-called "Syrian Recension" has been fully considered in a preceding section. Here I will simply call attention to the fact that so far as historical notices extend, the only recension, if recension it may be called, which is in any way connected with Antioch, is that which is associated with Lucian (312 A.D.); but, so far from being in the direction indicated by Dr. Hort, that recension unquestionably belonged to the school of Origen. This is a circumstance of exceeding importance inasmuch as it shows that some of the chief inferences drawn by Dr. Hort, from a long study of texts, are diametrically opposed to the facts most certainly known and most credibly attested in ancient and all but contemporary documents.

The Two Revisers deal in a very summary manner with one of the most important questions in the whole subject. In reference to their treatment of the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel they say (p. 52) first, "The textual facts, as in countless other passages, have been placed before the reader, because truth itself demanded it." And again (p. 53), after referring to their habit of noticing "in the margin facts of textual importance," they say, "We totally

decline to enter with the Reviewer into topics and arguments irrelevant to the course adopted by the Revisers."

The topics and arguments to which they allude appear to me the very reverse of "irrelevant." They rest upon external evidences of the highest authority and unquestioned antiquity: but as I have noticed some of the most important previously, I will here confine myself to the statement that "the textual facts" have been placed before the readers.

This is precisely the point upon which I should fix as open to the gravest objection. The textual fact on which the Revisers mainly rely is stated thus: "The two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities, omit from verse 9 to the end." Thus also Dr. Hort puts at the head of his authorities ℵ, B. ('Introduction,' Appendix, p. 45.)

But have we the testimony of those two manuscripts, which are thus cited as independent witnesses, and without any indication of doubt attaching to the evidence supplied by one or the other?

With regard to B, the fact that it presents a blank space entirely peculiar to this passage, indicating, indeed proving, the existence of a close omitted by the scribe, ought to have been noticed. As it seems to me "truth itself demanded" reference to a circumstance which so materially affects the evidence of that manuscript.

But there is a still more important fact, most important in itself, and peculiarly important in reference to the course adopted by the Revisers.

Tischendorf in his Prolegomena to the 'Novum Testamentum Vaticanum,' p. xxii., records a discovery, to which he refers repeatedly both in that work and in his edition of the Sinaitic Codex, that certain portions of the Sinaitic manuscript were written by the scribe of the entire Vatican; who, according to Tischendorf, acted as "corrector" (διορθωτής) of the former.

This discovery might of course be questioned. It rests upon facts of which experienced textual critics alone can appreciate the full significance; but for our present purpose it suffices to state that it is accepted unreservedly by Dr. Hort. (See his 'Introduction,' § 288.) I quote his own words: "The two manuscripts are really brought together as to their transcription in a singular manner by the fact observed by Tischendorf, that six leaves of the New Testament in ℵ are from the hand of the same scribe that wrote the New Testament in B. The fact appears to be sufficiently established by concurrent peculiarities in the form of one letter, punctuation, avoidance of contractions, and some points of orthography. As the six leaves are found on computation to form three pairs of conjugate leaves, holding different places in three distant quires, it seems probable that they are new or clean copies of corresponding leaves executed by the scribe who wrote the rest of the New Testament, but so disfigured either by an unusual number of corrections of clerical errors, or *from some unknown cause*, that they appeared unworthy to be retained, and were therefore cancelled and transcribed by the 'corrector.'"

The words thus printed in italics are of considerable importance. Considering the extreme haste with which the scribes and the "corrector" of the Sinaitic Codex worked, the costliness of the materials, the fact that an entire sheet in each case, *i.e.* the skin of an antelope, was to be sacrificed, and that this sheet was to be replaced without delay by the transcriber, whose time was especially precious, we may feel assured that a very strong cause indeed must have acted to bring about such a result. In this special case the most obvious cause, one certainly sufficient to account for the admitted fact, was the determination to obliterate from the later and apparently the more valuable manuscript all traces of the last portion of St. Mark's Gospel.

The first point which I would here press is, that in each instance of such transcription we have the witness of one person only, the scribe of B, so that to allege the authority of two manuscripts without noticing the identity of the transcriber is seriously misleading.

But Dr. Hort in that section of his 'Introduction' does not notice the fact, to which special importance must be attached, that a most conspicuous instance of a pair of leaves written by the scribe of B, and substituted for those written by the scribe of ℵ, occurs at the close of St. Mark's Gospel, extending from the latter part of the fifteenth chapter to a portion of St. Luke.*

Surely had Dr. Hort borne that fact in mind, had he not overlooked it when he enumerated evidences for the spuriousness of the passage in question, he could scarcely have cited ℵ and B as two "independent witnesses" (see App. p. 46). I cannot conceive how the Revisers, had they been cognizant of the fact, could have claimed the authority of the two oldest manuscripts as justifying their proceeding.

As it seems to me, "truth itself demanded" notice of both facts—(1) that B supplies evidence against its own hiatus, and (2) that from "some unknown cause" the testimony of ℵ is absolutely obliterated.

This proceeding is a strong example of a course adopted, as the Revisers say truly, "in countless other passages," to which there is serious objection.

The notices in the margin, sometimes that *many*, sometimes that *some*, ancient authorities, or that the *two oldest*

---

* Tischendorf, *l.c.* enumerates the places thus: "Matthæi fol. 10 et 15; Marci ultimum et primum Lucæ, prioris ad Thess. epistulæ alterum et epistulæ ad Hebræos tertium cum initio Apocalypsis." The first of these places, fol. 10, is of considerable importance, see above note on p. 75. The second sheet, 15, authorizes a reading in Matt. xxiv. 36, adopted by the Revisers, but suspicious as probably a case of assimilation.

manuscripts, favour a reading adopted or commended by the Revisers, ought surely to be accompanied by some explanation. As they stand they leave the reader without any means of ascertaining the value of the documents thus noticed, or the strength of the authorities to which they are opposed. They produce a general impression unfavourable to the authenticity of passages, some of which are of vital importance, and thus cast a deep shadow upon the reader's mind. The only excuse alleged for such a course appears to me singularly weak. It is simply that any attempts at explanation would have encumbered the margin. That excuse was certainly not contemplated when the Revisers drew up their own instructions.

If the Revisers find it necessary at any future time to publish a revision of their own work, I trust they will give full and satisfactory explanation in the notes which they retain, unless indeed they follow the safer, and, in my humble opinion, the only right course, and omit such notices altogether in reference to passages of gravest import, which are amply supported by ancient and trustworthy witnesses.

Some other statements in the treatise of the Two Revisers call for a notice. With reference to the defence of the reading εὐδοκίας, Luke ii. 14, the *Quarterly* Reviewer is said to be "ignoring Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles." I should be content to answer that the only appeal admissible in such cases is to ancient authorities, which the reader will find fully stated in the second part of this treatise, pp. 27, 28. I might also notice the fact that the authority of each of these critics is often ignored both by Westcott and Hort and by the Revisers, who discard or mark as doubtful some most important texts which are retained without hesitation by those critics; but as a rule I have abstained in this essay from quoting modern authorities. The other changes in St. Luke's Gospel defended by the Two Revisers, pp. 53–61,

have been similarly discussed, with the ancient authorities on both sides. But I must observe that the most important changes of all adopted in the text, or commended in the marginal notes, are passed over altogether by the Two Revisers. No defence is offered, no defence is suggested, for the grievous mutilation in St. Luke's account of the Institution of the Holy Communion, of the incidents in Gethsemane, of the first great word on the cross, of St. Peter's visit to the tomb, and of the Ascension.

Was it that the long array of evidences on which the Reviewer laid special stress, and to which I have referred in these pages, was too overwhelming to admit of a satisfactory or plausible answer? However this may be, I am quite content to leave it to the judgment of every impartial reader, whether those changes, apart from all other considerations, are not sufficient to justify the charges which I have most reluctantly, but with entire conviction, felt myself constrained to bring against the Revising Company.

One other point I must notice before I conclude this part of my subject. In pp. 17, 18, the importance of the testimony of the ante-Nicene Fathers, especially the Greek Fathers, Irenæus, Hippolytus, Clement, and Origen, is formally recognized; on p. 26, we are told that the "second reason [*sc.* the reason for adopting innovations] is based upon a close observation and a careful analysis of ante-Nicene patristic evidence," and in the note reference is made to "Westcott and Hort's 'Greek Testament, Introduction,' § 152–162, pp. 107 seqq."

Such an analysis is indeed a desideratum. Considering the learning and ability of the two editors, and the length of time which they had devoted to the subject, we might have reasonably expected that it would be supplied in an introduction so elaborate as that of Dr. Hort. But in sections 158–162, which deal specially with this subject, we find no

details, no attempt at a real analysis. Dr. Hort speaks, as might be expected, of the "strong light cast by the four eminent Fathers on textual history backward and forward;" but he leaves to the reader the work of examining their testimony.

Now, I do not profess to have accomplished, or to have attempted to accomplish, that work, so far as the general criticism of the Greek text is concerned; but this I have done, I have compared the readings in all the passages which have come under consideration in this work with citations in the ante-Nicene Fathers, so far as I could avail myself of the indices in the best editions, and notices in critical editions of the New Testament; and I have found in the great majority of instances, I may say in every instance of primary importance, that these Fathers do not favour the innovations. Irenæus is the chief voucher for the genuineness of the most signal of all passages mutilated or marked as suspicious by the Revisers. Clement of Alexandria does not appear to have cited the passages with which I am specially concerned; Origen, whose authority is adverse on several points, not, however, very serious ones, supports some readings to which I attach exceeding importance;* and as a general conclusion I must affirm that whatever may be the result as to the relative value of the two oldest manuscripts on the one side, or, on the other, of those which come nearest to them in age, and are supported by the vast majority of uncials and cursives, no evidence is adduced, in my belief no evidence is adducible, that those manuscripts which omit, modify, or mutilate the statements attributed to the Evangelists in the Received Text of the first three Gospels represent the text generally received in the second or third centuries and presumably identical with that delivered to the Church by St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke.

---

* See above, p. 191, note.

SECTION X.

Summary Statement—Recapitulation of Facts and Arguments.

The number and exceeding intricacy of the questions which have been discussed in this treatise may be fairly pleaded in extenuation of its very serious defects and shortcomings. Had it been possible for the writer to amend and complete his work, it would have been advisable to postpone its publication, whatever time might have been required. But, on the one hand, it is obvious that every one who has made up his mind on the plain broad facts, and the necessary inferences from those facts, is bound to declare his convictions, and, so far as may be in his power, to bring them to bear upon the minds of others who are specially interested in the discussion. On the other hand, the writer is conscious at once of his inability under any circumstances to deal exhaustively with the whole subject, and of the hopelessness at his advanced age of doing what he might otherwise attempt. What is to be done must be done quickly or be relinquished altogether; and I am confident that whatever may be thought of the cogency of the arguments which are based upon the facts here presented to the reader, the facts are in themselves of vital importance, and amply sufficient to guide every careful and unbiassed inquirer to a right conclusion.

The reader may, however, reasonably expect that these facts should be brought together, extricated from the mass of

statements more or less questionable, and presented in a clear, compact, and so far as may be practicable, in a tolerably complete form.

I will therefore now, in conclusion, ask him to consider well the bearings (*a*) of the facts admitted by all critics, or capable of exact determination and proof; (*b*) of inferences which may be logically deduced from these facts; and (*c*) the alternatives between which it is absolutely necessary that he must take a choice, under pain of remaining in a condition of hopeless embarrassment, in doubt as to the true solution of problems which now occupy the minds of earnest searchers after truth.

(A.) RECAPITULATION OF FACTS.

1. The two oldest manuscripts, referred to as such throughout the marginal notes of the Revised Version, date at the earliest from about the middle of the fourth century.

2. The manuscripts nearest to them in point of antiquity belong either to the latter part of the fourth, or at the latest, to the first part of the fifth century.

3. The oldest Versions are far more ancient than the oldest manuscripts. Some of them date from the beginning of the second century; others, which have been quoted as primary authorities in the preceding discussion, belong either to the third century, or at the latest are contemporary with the oldest extant manuscripts.

4. The testimony of the earliest Greek Fathers begins with the latter part of the first century, and from the second century continues without interruption down to the latest period which has been taken into consideration. The Latin Fathers begin somewhat later, but give a clear and consecutive view of the state of Christian thought in the West from the beginning of the third century.

5. The authority of those Fathers, as adduced in reference

to the passages discussed in the second part of this work, preponderates in favour of the text on which the Authorized Version is based, and preponderates to this extent, that the oldest Fathers on the one side, and the most weighty Fathers of the fourth century on the other, decidedly, and all but unanimously, support the passages which are here maintained, and are adverse to the most serious innovations.

6. About the middle of the third century attention was strongly drawn to the state of the Greek text, especially to the divergences in different classes or recensions, and the question was discussed with especial interest in the school of which Origen was the ablest and most influential leader.

7. In the same century, or in the beginning of the following century, numerous copies of the New Testament were made by Pamphilus in Palestine, by Lucian, Presbyter of Antioch, in Syria, and by Hesychius in Egypt. The copies made by Lucian were commonly used in Constantinople in the time of Jerome.* Those prepared by Pamphilus, or under his superintendence, were current in Asia Minor and Palestine; those by Hesychius, in Egypt. In short, throughout the East pupils or followers of Origen took the lead in what may not improperly be called a recension of the Greek text.

8. So far as *historical notices* extend, no indications can be found at that period that any other recension was undertaken in Syria, Palestine, or in any quarter of Christendom; in fact the well-known history of that time negatives the assumption that a critical revision of the text was executed under the authority of persons qualified and authorized to act as representatives of the Church.

9. In the middle of the fourth century, between A.D. 330 and A.D. 340, a period when Arianism was in the ascendency,

* See however on this point the note on pp. 201, 2.

fifty copies of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament and of the Greek text of the New Testament were written at Cæsarea, under the superintendence of Eusebius. This was done in obedience to an imperial mandate from Constantine, with the special view of supplying the churches then about to be erected in Constantinople with good, legible, and thoroughly well-executed copies of Holy Scripture.

10. Those copies were remarkable for the costliness of the materials, and for the beauty of the writing; the expenses were defrayed by the Emperor, and the best calligraphers were employed in obedience to his instructions.

11. The utmost haste in the execution was expressly and repeatedly enjoined by the Emperor, an injunction which, as Eusebius informs us, was strictly obeyed.

12. Two manuscripts, and two alone, of those now extant were written at that period—the Vatican, as all agree, and the Sinaitic, as is generally agreed.

13. These two manuscripts rank highest among those now extant for the excellence of the materials, and for the beauty of the writing.

14. Both of them are equally conspicuous for the number and character of their omissions, repetitions, and other blunders, attributable for the most part, in the judgment of able critics, to extreme haste on the part of the transcribers, and of their employers or superintendents.

15. The text of these two manuscripts, especially of the Vatican, corresponds, more closely than any other, to that which numerous citations in the works of Origen prove that he used habitually. Both manuscripts must have been prepared under the superintendence of a scholar closely connected with the school of which Origen was the head.

16. The text, thus identified with that adopted or moulded by Origen, differs in many points of more or less importance from that which was commonly used by Greek Fathers of

the fourth century. The difference is conspicuous in reference to the omissions and innovations to which special attention has been directed in this essay.

17. The Alexandrian Codex, A, comes nearest to the two oldest manuscripts in point of antiquity. It is admitted by critics to be the best representative of the text used during and after the fourth century by the Greek Fathers. In the Epistles it agrees generally with the Vatican Codex, but in the Gospels it differs from it widely, retaining with exceedingly few exceptions the passages obliterated, mutilated, or materially altered in the text which is founded mainly upon the authority of that manuscript.

The facts thus stated appear to me indisputable; I do not believe that they will be questioned by readers conversant with early ecclesiastical history. From these and from other well-supported statements which have been considered in connection with them, the following inferences may, in my opinion, be safely drawn; but as they are inferences only I present them here separately.

(B.) INFERENCES FROM CERTAIN FACTS.

1. I have for some time been strongly impressed with the conviction that the two manuscripts, which have furnished the Revisers with their new Greek text, were among those which Eusebius prepared by the order of Constantine. The combination of facts, external and internal—costliness of materials, beauty of writing, extreme haste accounting for a general habit of abbreviation, the character of the readings so closely connected with the citations in Origen, and other points previously discussed—appears to me incompatible with any other hypothesis. This view I now present as a fair, if not an inevitable, inference from the facts stated in the 9th to the 15th paragraphs of the preceding list.

2. But even if the reader should be so far moved by the authority of Drs. Westcott and Hort, and by the objections which have been urged by other critics, as to doubt whether either of those manuscripts, or both, were written at that time and place under the superintendence of Eusebius, the other facts stand fast, and the necessary inferences from them suffice for my main contention. Both manuscripts were certainly written under the same state of religious movements, at a time when Arianism was in full ascendency, when Eusebius of Cæsarea was the most prominent and the most influential leader of that party, when the transcriptions revised by Pamphilus, Lucian of Antioch, and Hesychius, all three representing the school of Origen, were received throughout the East from Constantinople to Egypt. At that time there was no indication of similar movements in other parts of Christendom; no notices or references to recensions or carefully revised transcriptions of the Greek text are found in connection with Italy, where Dr. Hort holds that the Vatican MS. may have been written: on the contrary, some fifty years or more after that time, Damasus, Bishop of Rome, found the text in a state of hopeless confusion, proving the absence of any recognized authority, such as Codex B would have supplied, had it then been produced under episcopal sanction. This was the special motive which induced him to call upon Jerome at once to supply a new Version, and to rectify erroneous readings prevalent throughout the West; readings most common in Codex D, which is supposed to represent the state of the Greek text in Western Christendom up to the fifth or sixth century.

Taking these facts into account I cannot but maintain that the only alternatives fairly open to our choice, with reference to the origin of those two MSS., are either that which I hold myself as all but certain, viz. that they were

written at Cæsarea, between 330 and 340 A.D. under the direction of Eusebius; or that they were written at Alexandria, during one of the long intervals when Athanasius was in banishment, and the see occupied by Arian intruders. This latter alternative, however, is open to objections which seem to me insurmountable.

3. But what after all is the real authority of manuscripts produced at that time under such circumstances? Are they entitled to outweigh the testimony of the numerous manuscripts which, as Dr. Hort repeatedly admits, represent the text commonly used by the great divines of the fourth century? Are they entitled to a hearing when they are opposed to ancient patristic citations—not mere *obiter dicta*, but adduced as decisive in gravest matters of controversy, such as we have alleged from Irenæus, Athanasius, and even from Origen? When the old Peshito, the Syriac Version, which must surely be regarded as the most trustworthy witness to the state of the text as received from the beginning in Palestine and all the adjoining districts, gives us distinct intimations of the existence of words, clauses, entire sentences which are obliterated or mutilated in those two manuscripts, can we hesitate as to which testimony has the best, the only rightful claim to acceptance? Whatever may be the result of an inquiry in reference to other portions of Scripture, I cannot doubt of the result in reference to the most important points, those which concern our Lord's own words, and incidents which are connected with the culminating period of His life.

4. I have above stated that my own inquiries have been here limited to these points, and I have also stated that, so far as I have observed, the same discrepancy between the evidence of those manuscripts and all other ancient authorities does not exist, certainly not to the same extent, in the case of the Pauline Epistles. The results of my own inquiry into

one portion of the New Testament are however so grave that I should look with apprehension to the results of close and careful investigations carried on by unbiassed and competent scholars in any other part of the New Testament; but upon that point I am not entitled to express—indeed I have not formed—a decided opinion. I have previously observed that in that portion of the New Testament, the Alexandrian Codex, and other uncials as well as cursives of the same school or recension, generally support the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices. But this would simply prove, or lead us to suppose, that in the case of the Epistles, especially the Pauline Epistles, there was at an early period a general agreement in manuscripts; owing, it may be, to some extent to their comparative paucity, or to the preservation of the Apostles' autographs in Churches to which these Epistles were severally addressed; or to the fact that they presented special difficulty to the student, and awakened special interest in reference to controversies which agitated the mind of Christendom. In each respect the evangelical records stood altogether on a different footing. The manuscripts both of the Greek text and of the early Versions of the Gospels were, so to speak, innumerable. No Christian of any means or position could dispense with a copy of some, if not all, the Gospels: whereas even in the time of Chrysostom other portions of the New Testament appear to have been little known. That great preacher tells his hearers that few of them knew even the Acts of the Apostles, many of them did not even know of the existence of that book. The Pauline Epistles were doubtless far better known, but in comparison with the four Gospels—needed by every Christian, and having a paramount right to his attention—the copies must have been small in number.

5. In fact, the immense number of manuscripts of the Gospels, once current but no longer extant, constitutes the

principal argument, the one most frequently urged by the counsellors of the Revisers. The three hundred years which elapsed before any manuscript now extant was written allow abundant space and opportunity for systematic constructions of conjectural history. Highly probable accounts of the distribution and classification of MSS., of so-called "genealogies," of modifications, corrections, innovations, and omissions, owing to "transcriptional errors," suggest themselves naturally to thoughtful students; and when they are patiently elaborated, skilfully put together, having occupied a powerful and singularly ingenious mind for many years, they present an appearance of reality which fascinates congenial spirits and may command the acquiescence of general inquirers; more especially when they are satisfied as to the perfect good faith of the critic, and are assured by competent judges that his theories rest upon a solid foundation of ascertained facts.

But when we put together all that has been urged in defence of that position, and see what would be the result if all that could be fairly demanded of us were conceded; we shall still have to pause, we should still have to answer such questions as the following:

6. When existing texts underwent critical recension, say by Origen or one of his school, have we reason to believe that the revisers were infallible? Were they guided by a spiritual instinct so sure that they could not be tempted, or, if tempted, could not give way to the temptation, to choose those readings which harmonized with their peculiar views, or satisfied their peculiar tastes? Given two readings, the one somewhat diffuse—as they might think—involving some repetition, presenting details which might seem to them superfluous, bearing in short the features which are recognized as characteristic of the second and third Gospels; and the other brief, somewhat obscure at first sight, containing some

detail or suggesting some notion from which commonplace readers might recoil, but which a subtle critic would be disposed to recognize as a mark of genuineness, can we doubt which would be preferred by a mind of the stamp of Origen? Would not the same motives bias his mind which have so powerfully influenced our modern critics?

7. But would the decision be always, would it be generally right? One thing is sure, it would be on the side of abbreviation or of concision (*κατατομή*): it would welcome innovations, even startling innovations, commended by the appearance of unconsciousness—in short it would issue in a text approaching to that which we have before us in the Vatican Codex.

I say approaching to it; but *magno intervallo.* I do not believe that the numberless omissions in that manuscript can be accounted for save by the extreme haste and consequent recklessness of the transcriber. Several omissions, as we have seen, are not countenanced by Origen. The Vatican manuscript may, it certainly does, bear close and unmistakeable indications of being revised under Origenistic influences, but in those respects it goes far beyond the utmost bounds reached or contemplated by the great master of speculative spirits in the early Church.

8. For my own part I am quite content to bear the imputation of adherence to old convictions slowly formed and repeatedly examined. I confess that even if there were a preponderance of manuscripts in favour of some of those innovations I should have felt that their evidence, standing alone, must be open to grave suspicion. Most thankful am I to know that in every passage but one the preponderance is on the other side: that the two manuscripts, to use the words of their advocates, in many instances stand alone, that in the great majority of instances they have but few supporters. But considering the infinite preciousness

of some incidents and words, either omitted in the Revised Version, or marked as doubtful in the margin, and the absolutely overpowering internal evidence by which they are supported, I should regard external evidence opposed to them as comparatively worthless, except in cases where there might be a practical consensus of the most ancient and trustworthy authorities.

The reader may of course feel that the impression made upon myself is a matter of indifference. Be it so. Let him look at the facts themselves, setting aside all prepossessions. These are the alternatives between which he must choose :—

(c.) THE ALTERNATIVES.

On the one side he has a long series of words and actions attested by ancient Fathers, by ancient Versions, by some three fourths of the older manuscripts, and by nine tenths of so-called cursive manuscripts, written under different circumstances, in different quarters of Christendom, and presenting independent testimony as to the mind of the Church : and those words and actions, be it ever remembered, are associated with the deepest and holiest thoughts, the most heart-stirring incidents in the Life of our Saviour.

On the other side, he has two manuscripts, with rare and doubtful supporters in antiquity ; manuscripts which, were the very highest claims of their upholders admitted, give us a text marked by peculiarities which specially account for the great majority of the innovations —a text which cannot be proved, or shown on probable grounds, to be an exact reproduction of primitive documents.

Will he hesitate as to his choice ?

This he may well do ; he may withhold acquiescence in any judgment which attaches a lower value to the two manuscripts in question than that which is assigned to them by

able critics. He may be disposed to accept their evidence in cases where other external or even internal proofs are not adducible; or, more wisely still, he may wait the issue of the controversy now fairly raised as to the real value of one or both; whether they are to count among the best or the least trustworthy of all existing documents. But one thing I do not fear that he will do. He will not accept or tolerate the assumption that they are virtually infallible; and nothing short of infallibility could justify acceptance of their evidence, where it impeaches the veracity of the sacred writers and the integrity of Holy Scripture, obliterates most precious words that fell from the lips of the dying Saviour, and expunges the records of crowning events of His Life.

THE END.

LONDON: PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED, STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.

50 Albemarle Street, London,
January 1882.

MR. MURRAY'S

LIST OF WORKS

IN

GENERAL LITERATURE,

CONTAINING

The Speaker's Commentary on the Bible.

History, Ancient & Modern.
Biography, Memoirs, &c.
Geography, Voyages, and Travels.
Handbooks for Travellers.
Theology, Religion, &c.
Science, Natural History, Geology, &c.
Art, Architecture, and Antiquities.
Educational Works.
Poetry, the Drama, &c.
Naval and Military Works.
Philosophy, Law, and Politics.
Rural & Domestic Economy.
Field Sports, &c.
Miscellaneous Literature and Philology.
Home and Colonial Library.

Dr. Wm. Smith's Atlas of Ancient Geography.

THE SPEAKER'S COMMENTARY.

Medium 8vo.

THE HOLY BIBLE, according to the Authorised Version, A.D. 1611, with an EXPLANATORY and CRITICAL COMMENTARY, and a REVISION of the TRANSLATION. By BISHOPS and CLERGY of the ANGLICAN CHURCH. Edited by F. C. COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

THE OLD TESTAMENT. 6 VOLS. 8VO, 135S.

Vol. I.—30s.

GENESIS—Bishop of Winchester.
EXODUS—Canon Cook and Rev. Samuel Clark.
LEVITICUS—Rev. Samuel Clark.
NUMBERS—Canon Espin and Rev. J. F. Thrupp.
DEUTERONOMY—Canon Espin.

Vols. II. and III.—36s.

JOSHUA—Canon Espin.
JUDGES, RUTH, SAMUEL—Bishop of Bath and Wells.
KINGS, CHRONICLES, EZRA, NEHEMIAH, ESTHER—Canon Rawlinson.

Vol. IV.—24s.

JOB—Canon Cook.
PSALMS—Dean Johnson, Canon Cook, and Canon Elliott.
PROVERBS—Dean of Wells.
ECCLESIASTES—Rev. W. T. Bullock.
SONG OF SOLOMON—Rev. T. Kingsbury.

Vol. V.—20s.

ISAIAH—Rev. Dr. Kay.
JEREMIAH AND LAMENTATIONS—Dean of Canterbury.

Vol. VI.—25s.

EZEKIEL—Rev. Dr. Currey.
DANIEL—Archdeacon Rose and Rev. J. Fuller.
HOSEA and JONAH—Rev. E. Huxtable.
AMOS, NAHUM, and ZEPHANIAH—Rev. R. Gandell.
JOEL and OBADIAH—Rev. F. Meyrick.
MICAH and HABAKKUK—Rev. Samuel Clark and Canon Cook.
HAGGAI, ZECHARIAH, and MALACHI—Canon Drake.

THE NEW TESTAMENT. 4 VOLS. 8VO, 94S.

Vol. I.—18s.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION—The Archbishop of York.
ST. MATTHEW & ST. MARK—Dean Mansel and Canon Cook.
ST. LUKE—Bishop of St. David's.

Vol. II.—20s.

ST. JOHN—Canon Westcott.
THE ACTS—Bishop of Chester.

Vol. III.—28s.

ROMANS—Canon Gifford.
CORINTHIANS—Canon Evans and Rev. J. Waite.
GALATIANS—Dean of Chester.
PHILIPPIANS, EPHESIANS, COLOSSIANS, THESSALONIANS, and PHILEMON—Rev. F. Meyrick, Dean of Raphoe, and Bishop of Derry.
PASTORAL EPISTLES—Bishop of London and Prof. Wace.

Vol. IV.—28s.

HEBREWS—Rev. Dr. Kay.
ST. JAMES—Dean of Rochester.
ST. JOHN—Bishop of Derry.
ST. PETER and ST. JUDE — Canon Cook and Prof. Lumby.
REVELATION of ST. JOHN—Archdeacon Lee.

With a Preface on the Completion of the Work. By the EDITOR.

THE STUDENT'S EDITION OF THE SPEAKER'S COMMENTARY on the Old Testament, abridged and edited. By J. M. FULLER, M.A., Vicar of Bexley, late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. 4 vols. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d. each.

Vol. I. GENESIS to DEUTERONOMY.
Vol. II. JOSHUA to ESTHER.
Vol. III. JOB to SONG OF SOLOMON.
Vol. IV. ISAIAH to MALACHI.

HISTORY ANCIENT AND MODERN.

Ancient History.

History of the Ancient World; from the earliest Records to the fall of the Western Empire, A.D. 476. By PHILIP SMITH. Plans. 3 vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

Student's Ancient History of the East. From the Earliest Times to the Conquest of Alexander the Great; including Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, Media, Persia, Asia Minor, and Phœnicia. By PHILIP SMITH. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

History of Egypt under the Pharaohs. Derived from the Monuments. With Memoir on the Exodus of the Israelites. By Dr. BRUGSCH. Maps. 2 vols. 8vo, 32s.

Nile Gleanings: the Ethnology, History, and Art of Ancient Egypt, as Revealed by Paintings and Bas-Reliefs. With Descriptions of Nubia and its Great Rock Temples to the Second Cataract. By VILLIERS STUART. With 58 Coloured and Outline Plates. Royal 8vo, 31s. 6d.

Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians: their Religion, Arts, Laws, Manufactures, etc. By Sir J. GARDNER WILKINSON. Revised by SAMUEL BIRCH, LL.D. Illustrations. 3 vols. 8vo, £4 : 4s.

Popular Account of the ANCIENT EGYPTIANS. By Sir J. G. WILKINSON. Illustrations. 2 vols. post 8vo, 12s.

The Five Great Monarchies of the ANCIENT EASTERN WORLD; or the History, Geography, and Antiquities of Chaldea, Assyria, Babylonia, Media, and Persia. By Canon RAWLINSON. Illustrations. 3 vols. 8vo, 42s.

Herodotus: A new English version. With notes and essays, historical and ethnographical. By Canon RAWLINSON, Sir HENRY RAWLINSON, and Sir J. G. WILKINSON. Illustrations. 4 vols. 8vo, 48s.

History of Greece, from the Earliest Period to the close of the Generation contemporary with Alexander the Great. By GEORGE GROTE. Library Edition. Portrait and Maps. 10 vols. 8vo, 120s.; or, Cabinet ed., Portrait and Plans, 12 vols. post 8vo, 6s. each.

Student's History of Greece, from the Earliest Times to the Roman Conquest, with the History of Literature and Art. By Dr. WM. SMITH. Maps and Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's History of Rome, from the Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Empire. With the History of Literature and Art. By Dean LIDDELL. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

History of the Decline and Fall of the ROMAN EMPIRE, By EDWARD GIBBON, with Notes by MILMAN and GUIZOT. Edited by Dr. WM. SMITH. Maps. 8 vols. 8vo, £3.

Student's Gibbon; an Epitome of the History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. By EDWARD GIBBON. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Dictionary of Greek and Roman ANTIQUITIES. Edited by Dr. WM. SMITH. Illustrations. Royal 8vo, 28s.

Dictionary of Greek and Roman BIOGRAPHY and MYTHOLOGY. Edited by Dr. WM. SMITH. Illustrations. 3 vols. royal 8vo, 84s.

Classical Dictionary of BIOGRAPHY, MYTHOLOGY, and GEOGRAPHY, for the Higher Forms. By Dr. WM. SMITH. Illustrations. 8vo, 18s.

Smaller Classical Dictionary of Mythology, Biography, and Geography. Woodcuts. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Smaller Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. Abridged from the large work. By Dr. WM. SMITH. Woodcuts. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Scripture and Church History.

Student's Old Testament History; from the Creation to the Return of the Jews from Captivity. By PHILIP SMITH. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's New Testament History. With an Introduction connecting the History of the Old and New Testaments. By PHILIP SMITH. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

History of the Jews, from the Earliest Period to Modern Times. By Dean MILMAN. 3 vols. Post 8vo, 18s.

History of the Jewish Church. By Dean STANLEY. 1st and 2d SERIES, Abraham to the Captivity. Maps. 2 vols. 8vo, 24s. 3d SERIES, Captivity to the Christian Era. Maps. 8vo, 14s.

History of Christianity, from the Birth of Christ to the Extinction of Paganism in the Roman Empire. By Dean MILMAN. 3 vols. post 8vo, 18s.

History of the Christian Church from the Apostolic Age to the Reformation, A.D. 64-1517. By Canon ROBERTSON. 8 vols. post 8vo, 6s. each.

History of Latin Christianity and of the Popes to Nicholas V. By Dean MILMAN. 9 vols. post 8vo, 54s.

Student's Manual of Ecclesiastical History. PART I.—From the Time of the Apostles to the Full Establishment of the Holy Roman Empire and the Papal Power. PART II.—The Middle Ages and the Reformation. By PHILIP SMITH. Woodcuts. 2 vols. post 8vo, 7s. 6d. each.

History of the Gallican Church, from the Concordat at Bologna, 1516, to the Revolution. By Rev. W. H. JERVIS. Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo, 28s.

History of the Eastern Church. By Dean STANLEY. Plans. 8vo, 12s.

Student's Manual of English Church History. FIRST PERIOD—From the Planting of the Church in Britain to the Accession of Henry VIII. SECOND PERIOD—From the Time of Henry VIII. to the Silencing of Convocation in the 18th Century. By Canon PERRY. 2 vols. post 8vo, 7s. 6d. each.

History of the Church of SCOTLAND. By Dean STANLEY. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, comprising the History, Institutions, and Antiquities of the Christian Church. Edited by Dr. WM. SMITH and Archdeacon CHEETHAM. Illustrations. 2 vols. med. 8vo, £3 : 13 : 6.

Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines, from the Time of the Apostles to the Age of Charlemagne. Edited by Dr. WM. SMITH and Rev. H. WACE. Vols. I. II. and III. Medium 8vo, 31s. 6d. each.

The Jesuits, their Constitution and Teaching. An Historical Sketch. By W. C. CARTWRIGHT. 8vo, 9s.

Notes on some Passages in the Liturgical History of the Reformed English Church. By Lord SELBORNE. 8vo, 6s.

Mediæval and Modern History.

An Account of the Modern Egyptians. By E. W. LANE. Illustrations. 2 vols. crown 8vo, 12s.

History of Europe during the MIDDLE AGES. By HENRY HALLAM. Library Edition. 3 vols. 8vo, 30s.; Cabinet Edition. 3 vols. post 8vo, 12s. Student's Edition. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's History of France. From the Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Second Empire, 1852. With Notes on the Institutions of the Country. By W. H. JERVIS. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's Hume; a History of ENGLAND, from the Earliest Times to the Revolution of 1688. Revised and continued to the Treaty of Berlin, 1878, by J. S. BREWER. With 7 Coloured Maps and 70 Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

History of England, from the Accession of Henry VII. to the Death of George II. By HENRY HALLAM. 3 vols. 8vo, 30s.; or Cabinet Edition, 3 vols. post 8vo, 12s. Student's Edition. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Literary History of Europe during the 15th, 16th, and 17th Centuries. Library Edn., 3 vols. 8vo, 36s. Cabinet Edn., 4 vols. post 8vo, 16s.

History of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy. By J. FOSTER KIRK. Portraits. 3 vols. 8vo, 45s.

Historical Memorials of Canterbury. 1. Landing of Augustine—2. Murder of Becket—3. Edward the Black Prince—4. Becket's Shrine. By Dean STANLEY. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

History of the United Netherlands, from the Death of William the Silent to the Twelve Years' Truce, 1609. By J. L. MOTLEY. Portraits. 4 vols. post 8vo, 6s. each.

Life and Death of John of BARNEVELD, Advocate of Holland. With a view of the primary causes and movements of the Thirty Years' War. By J. L. MOTLEY. Illustrations. 2 vols. post 8vo, 12s.

Student's History of Modern Europe, from the End of the Middle Ages to the Treaty of Berlin, 1878. *[In preparation.*

Sir John Northcotes's Note-book during the Long Parliament. From the Original MS. Edited by A. H. A. HAMILTON. Crown 8vo, 9s.

History of India—The Hindoo and Mohammedan Periods. By the Hon. MOUNTSTUART ELPHINSTONE. Edited by Professor COWELL. Map. 8vo, 18s.

Historic Peerage of England, Exhibiting the Origin, Descent, and Present State of every Title of Peerage which has existed since the Conquest. By Sir HARRIS NICOLAS. 8vo, 30s.

Two Sieges of Vienna by the TURKS. From the German. By Lord ELLESMERE. Post 8vo, 2s.

British India from its origin to 1783. By Earl STANHOPE. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

History of England, from the Reign of Queen Anne (1701) to the Peace of Versailles (1783). By Earl STANHOPE. 9 vols. post 8vo, 5s. each.

"The Forty-Five;" or, the Rebellion in Scotland in 1745. By Earl STANHOPE. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Historical Essays. By Earl STANHOPE. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

French Retreat from Moscow, and other Essays. By Earl STANHOPE. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Scenes from the War of Liberation in Germany. From the German. By Sir A. GORDON. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

The Siege of Gibraltar, 1772-1780, with a Description of that Garrison from the earliest periods. By JOHN DRINKWATER. Post 8vo, 2s.

Annals of the Wars of the 18th and 19th Centuries, 1700-1815. By Sir EDWARD CUST. Maps. 9 vols. 16mo, 5s. each.

State of Society in France BEFORE THE REVOLUTION, 1789. By ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE. Translated by HENRY REEVE. 8vo, 14s.

History of Europe during the FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1789-95. From the Secret Archives of Germany. By Professor VON SYBEL. 4 vols. 8vo, 48s.

English Battles and Sieges of the Peninsular War. By Sir W. NAPIER. Portrait. Post 8vo, 9s.

The Story of the Battle of WATERLOO. By Rev. G. R. GLEIG. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Wellington's Civil and Political Despatches, 1819-1831. Edited by his SON. 8 vols. 8vo, 20s. each.

Wellington's Supplementary Despatches and Correspondence. Edited by his SON. 15 vols. 8vo, 20s. each. An index. 8vo, 20s.

Campaigns at Washington and NEW ORLEANS. By Rev. G. R. GLEIG. Post 8vo, 2s.

Sir Robert Sale's Brigade in AFFGHANISTAN. By Rev. G. R. GLEIG, Post 8vo, 2s.

French in Algiers; the Soldier of the Foreign Legion—and Prisoners of Abd-el-Kadir. Translated by Lady DUFF GORDON. Post 8vo, 2s.

History of the Fall of the Jesuits in the Nineteenth Century. From the French. Post 8vo, 2s.

English in Spain; or, the Story of the Civil War between Christinos and Carlists in 1834, 1840. By Major F. DUNCAN, R.A. With plates. 8vo, 16s.

Personal Narrative of Events in China during Lord Elgin's Second Embassy. By H. B. LOCH. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 9s.

History of the Royal Artillery. Compiled from the original Records. By Major F. DUNCAN, R.A. Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo, 18s.

The Huguenots in England & Ireland, their Settlements, Churches, and Industries. By SAMUEL SMILES. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey, from its Foundation to the Present Time. By Dean STANLEY. Illustrations. 8vo, 15s.

Notices of the Historic Persons buried in the Chapel of St. Peter, in the Tower of London, with an Account of the Discovery of the Remains of Queen Anne Boleyn. By DOYNE C. BELL. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 14s.

Handbook to St. Paul's Cathedral. By Dean MILMAN. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Annals of Winchcombe and Sudeley. By EMMA DENT. With Plates. 4to, 42s.

English Studies. By J. S. BREWER. CONTENTS: New Sources of English History. Green's Short History of the English People. The Royal Supremacy. Hatfield House. The Stuarts. Shakspeare. How to Study English History. Ancient London. Erasmus. 8vo, 14s.

BIOGRAPHY AND MEMOIRS.

Ecclesiastical and Missionary.

Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines, from the time of the Apostles to the Age of Charlemagne. Edited by Dr. WM. SMITH and Professor WACE. Vols. I. II. and III. Med. 8vo, 31s. 6d. each.

Life of St. Hugh of Avalon, Bishop of Lincoln. By Canon PERRY. Portrait. Post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Life and Times of St. John Chrysostom. A Sketch of the Church and the Empire in the Fourth Century. By Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, M.A. With Portrait. 8vo, 12s.

Personal Life of Dr. Livingstone. From his unpublished Journals and Correspondence. By W. G. BLAIKIE, D.D. With Portrait and Map. 8vo, 15s.

Memoir of William Ellis, the Missionary. By his SON. Portrait. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Memoir of Bishop Milman, Metropolitan of India. With a Selection from his Letters. By his SISTER. Map. 8vo, 12s.

Life of Bishop SUMNER, during an Episcopate of Forty Years. By Rev. G. H. SUMNER. Portrait. 8vo, 14s.

Life of Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford and Winchester. Vol. I. By Canon ASHWELL. Vol. II. Edited by R. G. WILBERFORCE. Portraits. 8vo, 15s. each.

Life of John Wilson, D.D. (of Bombay); Fifty Years a Philanthropist and Scholar in the East. By GEORGE SMITH. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 9s.

Political and Social.

Memoir of the Public Life of Right Hon. John Charles Herries during the reigns of George III., George IV., William IV., and Victoria. By his Son, ED. HERRIES, C.B. 2 vols. 8vo, 24s.

Monographs: Personal and Social. By Lord HOUGHTON. Portraits. Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Self-Help. With Illustrations of Conduct and Perseverance. By Dr. SMILES. Post 8vo, 6s.; or in French, 5s.

Life and Death of John of BARNEVELD, Advocate of Holland. With a View of the Primary Causes and Movements of "The Thirty Years' War." By J. L. MOTLEY. Illustrations. 2 vols. post 8vo, 12s.

Rheinsberg; Memorials of Frederick the Great and Prince Henry of Prussia. By ANDREW HAMILTON. 2 vols. crown 8vo, 21s.

Life and Correspondence of Dr. Arnold of Rugby. By Dean STANLEY. With the Author's latest Corrections, and an unpublished Poem by KEBLE. Portrait. 2 vols. cr. 8vo. 12s.

Memoir of Edward, Catherine, and Mary Stanley. By Dean STANLEY. Post 8vo, 9s.

Memoirs of Sir Fowell Buxton, with Extracts from his Correspondence. By CHARLES BUXTON. Portrait. 8vo, 16s.; or post 8vo, 5s.

King William IV.'s Correspondence with the late Earl GREY, 1830-1832. Edited by his SON. 2 vols. 8vo, 30s.

Life of Theodore Hook. By J. G. LOCKHART. Fcap. 8vo, 1s.

Memoir of Hon. Julian Fane. By Lord LYTTON. Portrait. Post 8vo, 5s.

Selection from the Familiar Correspondence of Sir CHARLES BELL. Portrait. Post 8vo, 12s.

Madame de Staël, a Study of her Life and Times. By Dr. A. STEVENS. With Portraits. 2 vols. Crown 8vo, 24s.

Adventures on the Road to Paris, 1813-14. From the Autobiography of HENRY STEFFENS. Post 8vo, 2s.

Sketches of Eminent Statesmen and Writers. Reprinted from the *Quarterly Review*. By A. HAYWARD, Q.C. 2 vols. 8vo, 28s. CONTENTS:—Thiers, Bismarck, Cavour, Metternich, Montalembert, Melbourne, Wellesley, Byron and Tennyson, Venice, St. Simon, Sévigné, Du Deffand, Holland House, Strawberry Hill.

Life of William Pitt. By Earl STANHOPE. Portraits. 3 vols. 8vo, 36s.

Brief Memoir of the Princess CHARLOTTE OF WALES. By Lady ROSE WEIGALL. Portrait. Crown 8vo, 8s. 6d.

Life of William Wilberforce. By his SON. Portrait. Post 8vo, 6s.

Memoirs; By Sir Robert Peel. Edited by Earl STANHOPE and Lord CARDWELL. 2 vols. post 8vo, 15s.

Mrs. Grote; a Sketch. By Lady EASTLAKE. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Literary and Artistic.

Dictionary of Greek & Roman Biography and Mythology. Edited by Dr. Wm. Smith. 3 vols. 8vo, 84s.

Personal Life of George Grote, the Historian of Greece. Compiled from Family Documents. By Mrs. Grote. Portrait. 8vo, 12s.

Life and Works of Albert Dürer. By Moriz Thausing. Edited by F. A. Eaton, Sec. Royal Academy. Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, 42s.

Michel Angelo, Sculptor, Painter, and Architect; including Documents from the Buonarroti Archives. By C. Heath Wilson. Plates. 8vo, 15s.

Titian: his Life and Times, with some Account of his Family from Unpublished Documents. By J. A. Crowe and G. B. Cavalcaselle. Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, 21s.

The Early Life of Jonathan Swift. By John Forster. 1667-1711. Portrait. 8vo, 15s.

Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson. By James Boswell. Edited by J. W. Croker. With Notes by Lord Stowell, Sir Walter Scott, Sir James Mackintosh, Disraeli, Markland, Lockhart, &c. Medium 8vo, 12s.

Johnson's Lives of the English Poets. Edited by Cunningham. 3 vols. 8vo, 22s. 6d.

Life of Jonathan Swift. By Henry Craik, B.A. 8vo.

Life and Letters of Lord Byron With Notices of his Life. By Thomas Moore. Portraits. Royal 8vo, 7s. 6d.; or 6 vols. fcap. 8vo, 18s.

Life of Lord Byron, with an Essay on his Place in Literature. By Carl Elze. Portrait. 8vo, 16s.

Lives of the British Poets. By Thomas Campbell. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Memoir of Sir Charles Eastlake. By Lady Eastlake. Prefixed to his Contributions to the Literature of the Fine Arts. 2 vols. 8vo, 24s.

Popular Biographies—Bunyan, Cromwell, Clive, Conde, Drake, Munro. See *Home and Colonial Library*, p. 30.

Life and Times of Sir Joshua Reynolds. With Notes of his Contemporaries. By C. R. Leslie and Tom Taylor. Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo, 42s.

Lives of the Early Italian Painters; illustrating the Progress of Painting in Italy from Cimabue to Bassano. By Mrs. Jameson. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 12s.

Lives of the Early Flemish Painters, and Notices of their Works. By Crowe and Cavalcaselle. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.; or large paper, 15s.

Life of Horace. By Dean Milman. 8vo, 9s.

Life and Works of Sir Charles Barry, R.A. By Canon Barry, D.D. Portrait and Illustrations. 8vo, 15s.

Naval and Military.

Lives of the Warriors of the 17th Century. By Sir Edward Cust, D.C.L. 6 vols. crown 8vo, 50s.

Character, Actions, and Writings of Wellington. By Jules Maurel. Fcap. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Letters and Journals of F.-M. Sir Wm. Gomm, G.C.B., Commander-in-Chief in India, Constable of the Tower, and Colonel of the Coldstream Guards, 1799-1815. By F. C. Carr Gomm. Portraits. 8vo, 12s.

Napoleon at Fontainbleau and Elba. Being a Journal of Occurrences and Notes of Conversations, &c. By Sir Neil Campbell. Portrait. 8vo, 15s.

Letters and Journals of the Earl of Elgin, Governor-General of India. Edited by Theodore Walrond. 8vo, 14s.

Memoirs of the Duke of Saldanha, Soldier and Statesman. With Selections from his Correspondence. By Conde da Carnota. With Portrait and Maps. 2 vols. 8vo, 32s.

Memoir of Sir John Burgoyne. By Sir Francis Head. Post 8vo, 1s.

Autobiography of Sir John Barrow, Bart. Portrait. 8vo, 16s.

Private Diary of General Sir Robert Wilson: during Missions and Employments with the European Armies in 1812-1814. Map. 2 vols. 8vo, 26s.

Reminiscences of Forty Years' Service in India. By Lieut.-Gen. Sir George Lawrence. Including the Cabul Disasters, and Captivities in Affghanistan. Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Life of Belisarius. By Lord Mahon. Post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Legal and Scientific.

Lives of the Lord Chancellors and Keepers of the Great Seal of England, from the Earliest Times to the death of Lord Eldon, 1838. By Lord Campbell. 10 vols. post 8vo, 6s. each.

Lives of the Chief Justices of England, from the Norman Conquest till the death of Lord Tenterden. By Lord Campbell. 4 vols. cr. 8vo, 6s. each.

Life and Letters of Lord Campbell, Lord Chief-Justice, and afterwards Lord Chancellor of England. Based on his Autobiography, Journals, and Correspondence. Edited by Hon. Mrs. Hardcastle. With Portrait. 2 vols. 8vo, 30s.

Life of Lord Chancellor Eldon. By Horace Twiss. Portrait. 2 vols. post 8vo, 21s.

Biographia Juridica. A Biographical Dictionary of the Judges of England, from the Conquest to 1870. By Edward Foss. Medium 8vo, 21s.

Lives of the Engineers. From the Earliest Times to the Death of the Stephensons. With an Account of the Steam Engine and Railway Locomotive. By Samuel Smiles, LL.D. 9 Portraits and 340 Woodcuts, 5 vols. crown 8vo, 7s. 6d. each.

Life, Letters, and Journals of Sir Charles Lyell. Edited by his Sister-in-Law, Mrs. Lyell. Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo, 30s.

Industrial Biography; or, Iron-Workers and Tool-Makers. By Samuel Smiles. Post 8vo, 6s.

Life of Thomas Edward (Shoemaker, of Banff), Scotch Naturalist. By Samuel Smiles. Illustrated. Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Life of Robert Dick (Baker, of Thurso), Geologist and Botanist. By S. Smiles. Illustrations. Cr. 8vo, 12s.

Memoir of Sir Roderick Murchison. With Notices of his Contemporaries, and a Sketch of Palæozoic Geology in Britain. By Professor Geikie. Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo, 30s.

Memoir and Correspondence of Caroline Herschel, Sister of Sir William and Aunt of Sir John Herschel. Portraits. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Personal Recollections, from Early Life to Old Age. By Mary Somerville. Portrait. Crown 8vo, 12s.

Life of Erasmus Darwin. By Charles Darwin. With a Study of his Scientific Works by Dr. Krause. Portrait, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

GEOGRAPHY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

The East Indies, China, &c.

India in 1880. By Sir Richard Temple, Bart. 8vo, 16s.

Student's Manual of the Geography of India. By George Smith, LL.D. Post 8vo. *[In the Press.*

Travels of Marco Polo. A new English version. Illustrated with copious Notes. By Col. Yule, C.B. Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, 63s.

A Visit to High Tartary, Yarkand, and Kashgar, and over the Karakorum Pass. By Robert Shaw. Illustrations. 8vo, 16s.

New Japan; The Land of the Rising Sun. Its Annals during the past twenty years; recording the remarkable progress of the Japanese in western civilisation. By Samuel Mossman. Map. 8vo, 15s.

A Cruise in the Eastern Seas, from the Corea to the River Amur. With an Account of Russian Siberia, Japan, and Formosa. By Capt. B. W. Bax. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 12s.

British Burma and its People: Sketches of Native Manners, Customs, and Religion. By Capt. Forbes. Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

The River of Golden Sand. Narrative of a Journey through China to Burmah. By Capt. Wm. Gill, R.E. With a Preface by Col. Yule. With Map. 2 vols. 8vo, 30s.

The Satsuma Rebellion. An Episode of Modern Japanese History. By Augustus H. Mounsey. Map. Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Letters from Madras. By a Lady. Post 8vo, 2s.

Journey to the Source of the River Oxus, by the Indus, Kabul, and Badakhshan. By Capt. Wood. With the Geography of the Valley of the Oxus, by Col. Yule. Map. 8vo, 12s.

Thirteen Years' Residence at the Court of China, in the Service of the Emperor. By Father Ripa. Post 8vo, 2s.

Popular Account of the Manners and Customs of India. By Rev. Chas. Acland. Post 8vo, 2s.

Nineveh and its Remains. With an Account of a Visit to the Chaldean Christians of Kurdistan, and the Yezedis or Devil Worshippers, &c. By Sir H. LAYARD. Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, 36s.; or post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Nineveh and Babylon; a Narrative of a Second Expedition to the Ruins of Assyria, with Travels in Armenia. By Sir H. LAYARD. Illustrations. 8vo, 21s.; or post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Unbeaten Tracks in Japan. Travels of a Lady in the Interior, including Visits to the Aborigines of Yezo and the Shrines of Nikko and Isé. By ISABELLA L. BIRD. Map and Illustrations. 2 vols. crown 8vo, 24s.

Japan; Its History, Traditions, and Religions, with the Narrative of a Visit in 1879. By Sir E. J. REED, K.C.B. With Map and Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, 28s.

Africa—Egypt.

A Popular Account of Dr. Livingstone's Travels and Adventures in South Africa, 1840-56. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

A Popular Account of Dr. Livingstone's Expedition to the Zambesi, Lakes Shirwa and Nyassa, 1858-64. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Dr. Livingstone's Last Journals in CENTRAL AFRICA, 1865-73. With a Narrative of his last moments and sufferings. By Rev. HORACE WALLER. Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, 15s.

Livingstonia; Journal of Adventures in Exploring Lake Nyassa, and Establishing a Settlement there. By E. D. YOUNG, R.N. Map. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Explorations in Equatorial Africa, with Accounts of the Savage Tribes, the Gorilla, &c. By P. DU CHAILLU. Illustrations. 8vo, 21s.

Journey to Ashango Land, and Further Penetration into Equatorial Africa. By P. B. DU CHAILLU. Illustrations. 8vo, 21s.

Adventures and Discoveries among the Lakes and Mountains of Eastern Africa. By Captain ELTON and H. B. COTTERILL. With Map and Illustrations. 8vo, 21s.

Wanderings South of the Atlas Mountains, in the Great Sahara. By Canon TRISTRAM. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 15s.

Six Months in Ascension. An Unscientific Account of a Scientific Expedition. By Mrs. GILL. Map. Crown 8vo. 9s.

Five Years' Adventures in the far Interior of S. Africa with the Wild Beasts of the Forests. By R. GORDON CUMMING. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 6s.

Recollections of Fighting and Hunting in South Africa, 1834-67. By Gen. Sir JOHN BISSET, C.B. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 14s.

Nile Gleanings: The Ethnology, History, and Art of Ancient Egypt, as revealed by Paintings and Bas-Reliefs. By H. VILLIERS STUART. With 50 coloured Illustrations. Royal 8vo, 31s.6d.

The Country of the Moors. A Journey from Tripoli in Barbary to the Holy City of Kairwan. By EDWARD RAE. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 12s.

A Residence in Sierra Leone, described from a Journal kept on the Spot. By a LADY. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

British Mission to Abyssinia. With Notices of the Countries traversed from Massowah, through the Soodan, and back to Magdala. By HORMUZD RASSAM. Illustrations. 2 vols. 30s.

Sport in Abyssinia. By Earl of MAYO. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 12s.

Abyssinia during a Three Years' Residence. By MANSFIELD PARKYNS. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Adventures in the Libyan Desert. By B. ST. JOHN. Post 8vo, 2s.

Travels in Egypt, Nubia, Syria, and the Holy Land. By Captains IRBY and MANGLES. Post 8vo, 2s.

The Cradle of the Blue Nile. A Visit to the Court of King John of Ethiopia. By E. A. DE COSSON. Illustrations. 2 vols. post 8vo, 21s.

An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians. By EDWARD WM. LANE. Woodcuts. 2 vols. post 8vo, 12s.

Madagascar Revisited; Describing the Persecutions endured by the Christian Converts. By Rev. W. ELLIS. Illustrations, 8vo, 16s.

Mediterranean—Greece, Turkey in Europe.

Travels in Asia Minor: With Antiquarian Researches and Discoveries, and Illustrations of Biblical Literature and Archæology. By H. VAN LENNEP. Illustrations. 2 vols. post 8vo, 24s.

Ilios; a History of the City and Country of the Trojans, including all Recent Discoveries on the Site of Troy and the Troad in 1871-3 and 1878-9. With an Autobiography. By Dr. SCHLIEMANN. Illustrations. Imperial 8vo, 50s.

Discoveries on the Sites of Ancient Mycenæ and Tiryns. By Dr. SCHLIEMANN. With a Preface by the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. Illustrations. Medium 8vo, 50s.

Cyprus; its Ancient Cities, Tombs, and Temples. A Narrative of Researches and Excavations during Ten Years' Residence in that Island. By LOUIS P. DI CESNOLA. Illustrations. Medium 8vo, 50s.

Bulgaria before the War: a Seven Years' Experience of European Turkey and its Inhabitants. By H. C. BARKLEY. Post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Between the Danube and the Black Sea; or, Five Years in Bulgaria. By H. C. BARKLEY. Post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Researches in the Highlands of Turkey. With Notes on the Classical Superstitions of the Modern Greek. By Rev. H. F. TOZER. Illustrations. 2 vols. crown 8vo, 24s.

Lectures on the Geography of Greece. By Rev. H. F. TOZER. Map. Post 8vo, 9s.

Twenty Years' Residence among the Bulgarians, Greeks, Albanians, Turks, and Armenians. By a Consul's Wife. 2 vols. crown 8vo, 21s.

Reminiscences of Athens and the Morea, during Travels in Greece. By Lord CARNARVON. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Asia, Syria, Holy Land.

England and Russia in the East. A Series of Papers on the Political and Geographical Condition of Central Asia. By Sir H. RAWLINSON. Map. 8vo, 12s.

The Caucasus, Persia and Turkey in Asia. A journey to Tabreez, Kurdistan, down the Tigris and Euphrates to Nineveh and Babylon, and across the Desert to Palmyra. By Baron THIELMANN. Illustrations. 2 vols. post 8vo, 18s.

Sketches of the Manners and Customs of Persia. By Sir JOHN MALCOLM. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Sinai and Palestine; in Connection with their History. By Dean STANLEY. Plans. 8vo, 14s.

The Bible in the Holy Land. Extracts from the above Work. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Journal of Researches in the Holy Land in 1838 and 1852. With Historical Illustrations. By EDWARD ROBINSON, D.D. Maps. 3 vols. 8vo, 42s.

Damascus, Palmyra, Lebanon; with Travels among the Giant Cities of Bashan and the Hauran. By Rev. J. L. PORTER. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Jordan, the Nile, Red Sea, Lake of Gennesareth, etc. The Cruise of the Rob Roy in Palestine, Egypt, and the Waters of Damascus. By JOHN MACGREGOR. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Land of Moab. Travels and Discoveries on the East Side of the Dead Sea and the Jordan. By Canon TRISTRAM. Illustrations. Cr. 8vo, 15s.

The Bedouins of the Euphrates Valley. By Lady ANNE BLUNT. With some account of the Arab Horses. Illustrations. 2 vols. crown 8vo, 24s.

A Pilgrimage to Nejd, the Cradle of the Arab Race, and a Visit to the Court of the Arab Emir. By Lady ANNE BLUNT. With Illustrations. 2 vols. post 8vo, 24s.

Visits to the Monasteries of the Levant. By the Hon. ROBERT CURZON (Lord de la Zouche). With Illustrations. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Australia, Polynesia, &c.

Discoveries in New Guinea. A Cruise in Polynesia, and Visits to Torres Straits, etc. By Capt. MORESBY, Illustrations. 8vo, 15s.

The Gardens of the Sun; or a Naturalist's Journal on the Mountains and in the Forests and Swamps of Borneo and the Sulu Archipelago. By F. W. BURBIDGE. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 14s.

A Boy's Voyage Round the World. Edited by SAMUEL SMILES. Woodcuts. Small 8vo, 6s.

Hawaiian Archipelago; Six Months among the Palm Groves, Coral Reefs, and Volcanoes of the SANDWICH ISLANDS. By ISABELLA BIRD. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Ride Through the Disturbed Districts of NEW ZEALAND to Lake Taupo at the time of the Rebellion; with notes of the South Sea Islands. By Hon. H. MEADE. Illustrations. 8vo, 12s.

Typee and Omoo; or the Marquesas and South Sea Islanders. By H. MELVILLE. 2 vols. post 8vo, 7s.

Notes and Sketches of New South Wales. By Mrs. MEREDITH. Post 8vo, 2s.

America, West Indies, Arctic Regions.

A Lady's Life in the Rocky Mountains. By ISABELLA BIRD. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Mexico and the Rocky Mountains. By GEORGE F. RUXTON. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Pioneering in South Brazil. Three Years of Forest and Prairie Life in the Province of Paraña. By T. P. Bigg Wither. Illustrations. 2 vols. crown 8vo, 24s.

The Naturalist on the River Amazon, with Adventures during Eleven Years of Travel. By H. W. Bates. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Voyage up the River Amazon and a visit to Para. By William H. Edwards. Post 8vo, 2s.

Voyage of a Naturalist round the World. By Chas. Darwin. Post 8vo, 9s.

The Patagonians; a Year's Wandering over Untrodden Ground from the Straits of Magellan to the Rio Negro. By Capt. Musters. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Voyage of the "Fox" in the Arctic Seas, and the Discovery of the Fate of Sir John Franklin and his Companions. By Sir Leopold M'Clintock. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Perils of the Polar Seas. True Stories of Arctic Discovery and Adventure. By Mrs. Chisholm. Illustrations. Small 8vo, 6s.

Communistic Societies of the United States; their Religious Creeds, Social Practices, and Present Condition. By Charles Nordhoff. Illustrations. 8vo, 15s.

Europe.

The White Sea Peninsula. A Journey to the White Sea, and the Kola Peninsula. By Edward Rae. With Map, 12 Etchings, and 14 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo, 15s.

The Land of the Midnight Sun. Summer and Winter Journeys through Sweden, Norway, Lapland, and Northern Finland. With descriptions of the Inner Life of the People, their Manners, Customs, Primitive Antiquities, etc. By Paul B. du Chaillu. Map and 235 Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, 36s.

Etchings on the Mosel: a Series of 20 Plates, with Descriptive Letterpress. By Ernest George. Folio, 42s.

Etchings from the Loire and South of France. In a Series of Twenty Plates, with Descriptive Text. By Ernest George. Folio, 42s.

Field Paths and Green Lanes. Being Country Walks, chiefly in Surrey and Sussex. By Louis J. Jennings. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Rambles among the Hills; or, Walks on the Peak of Derbyshire and in the South Downs. By L. J. Jennings. With Illustrations. Post 8vo, 12s.

Twenty Years in the Wild West of Ireland; or, Life in Connaught. By Mrs. Houstoun. Crown 8vo, 9s.

The Ascent of the Matterhorn. By Edward Whymper. 100 Illustrations. Medium 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Siberia in Europe; a Naturalist's Voyage to the Valley of the Petchora in N.E. Russia. By Henry Seebohm. With Map and Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 14s.

A Month in Norway. By J. G. Hollway. Fcap. 8vo, 2s.

Letters from the Shores of the Baltic. By a Lady. Post 8vo, 2s.

Letters from High Latitudes: An Account of a Yacht Voyage to Iceland, Jan Mayen, and Spitzbergen. By Lord Dufferin. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Bible in Spain; or, the Journeys, Adventures, and Imprisonments of an Englishman in the Peninsula. By George Borrow. Post 8vo, 5s.

The Gypsies of Spain; their Manners, Customs, Religion, and Language. By Geo. Borrow. Post 8vo, 5s.

Gatherings from Spain. By Richard Ford. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Bubbles from the Brunnen of Nassau. By Sir Francis Head. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

General Geography.

A History of Ancient Geography among the Greeks and Romans, from the Earliest Ages till the Fall of the Roman Empire. By E. H. Bunbury. 2 vols. 8vo, 42s.

Art of Travel; or, Hints on the Shifts and Contrivances available in Wild Countries. By Francis Galton. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography. Edited by Dr. Wm. Smith. 2 vols. royal 8vo, 56s.

Atlas of Ancient Geography, Biblical and Classical, compiled under the superintendence of Dr. Wm. Smith and Mr. George Grove. Folio, £6:6s.

Student's Manual of Ancient Geography. By Canon Bevan, M.A. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's Manual of Modern Geography, Mathematical, Physical, and Descriptive. By Canon Bevan, M.A. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

A School Manual of Modern Geography, Physical and Political. By John Richardson, M.A. Post 8vo, 5s.

A Smaller Manual of Modern Geography, Physical and Political. Post 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Journal of the Royal Geographical Society. 8vo. From 1831 to the present time.

HANDBOOKS FOR TRAVELLERS.

Foreign.

Handbook — Travel Talk;— English, French, German, and Italian. 16mo, 3s. 6d.

Handbook—Holland and Belgium. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 6s.

Handbook—North Germany; the Rhine, the Black Forest, the Hartz, Thüringerwald, Saxon Switzerland, Rügen, the Giant Mountains, Taunus, Odenwald, Elass, and Lothringen. Map and Plans. Post 8vo, 10s.

Handbook—Switzerland; The Alps of Savoy and Piedmont. Maps and Plans. In Two Parts. Post 8vo, 10s.

Handbook—South Germany; Tyrol, Bavaria, Austria, Salzburg, Styria, Hungary, and the Danube from Ulm to the Black Sea. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 10s.

Handbook—France. Part I. Normandy, Brittany, The French Alps, the Loire, Seine, Garonne, and Pyrenees. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Handbook—France. Part II. Auvergne, the Cevennes, Burgundy, the Rhone and Saone, Provence, Nimes, Arles, Marseilles, the French Alps, Alsace, Lorraine, Champagne, etc. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Handbook—Paris and its Environs. Maps and Plans. 16mo, 3s. 6d.

Handbook — Mediterranean: Its principal Islands, Cities, Seaports, Harbours, and Borderlands. With nearly 50 Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 20s.

Handbook—Algeria and Tunis; Algiers, Constantin, Oran, the Atlas Range, etc. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 10s.

Handbook — Spain; Madrid, The Castiles, Basque, Asturias, Galicia, Estremadura, Andalusia, Ronda, Granada, Murcia, Valencia, Catalonia, Aragon, Navarre, Balearic Islands. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 20s.

Handbook—Portugal; Lisbon, Oporto, Cintra, etc. Map. Post 8vo, 12s.

Handbook—North Italy; Piedmont, Nice, Lombardy, Venice, Parma, Modena, and Romagna. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 10s.

Handbook—Central Italy; Tuscany, Florence, Lucca, Umbria, The Marches, and the Patrimony of St. Peter. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 10s.

The Cicerone; or, Art Guide to Painting in Italy. By Dr. Jacob Burckhardt. Post 8vo, 6s.

Handbook—Rome and its Environs. Map and Plans. Post 8vo, 10s.

Handbook—South Italy; Two Sicilies, Naples, Pompeii, Herculaneum, Vesuvius, Abruzzi. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 10s.

Handbook—Egypt; the Nile, Egypt, Nubia, Alexandria, Cairo, The Pyramids, Thebes, Suez Canal, Peninsula of Sinai, The Oases, the Fyoom. Map and Plans. In Two Parts. Post 8vo, 15s.

Handbook — Greece; Ionian Islands, Athens, Peloponnesus, Ægæan Sea, Albania, Thessaly, and Macedonia. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo.

Handbook—Turkey in Asia; Constantinople, The Bosphorus, Dardanelles, Brousa, Plain of Troy, Crete, Cyprus, Smyrna, Ephesus, the Seven Churches, Coasts of the Black Sea, Armenia, Mesopotamia. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 15s.

Handbook—Denmark; Sleswig-Holstein, Copenhagen, Jutland, Iceland. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 6s.

Handbook—Sweden; Stockholm, Upsala, Gothenburg, the Shores of the Baltic, etc. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo.

Handbook—Norway; Christiania, Bergen, Trondhjem, the Fjelds, Iceland. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 9s.

Handbook—Russia; St. Petersburg, Moscow, Poland, Finland, The Crimea, Caucasus, Siberia, and Central Asia. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 18s.

Handbook — Bombay. Map. Post 8vo, 15s.

Handbook — Madras. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 15s.

Handbook — Bengal. Map. Post 8vo, 15s.

Handbook—Holy Land; Syria, Palestine, Sinai, Edom and the Syrian Deserts, Jerusalem, Petra, Damascus, and Palmyra. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 20s.

Travelling Map of Palestine, Mounted and in a Case. 12s.

English.

Handbook—London as it is. Map and Plans. 16mo, 3s. 6d.

Handbook—Environs of London, within 20 miles round of the Metropolis. 2 vols. Post 8vo, 21s.

Handbook—England & Wales. Condensed in one Volume. Forming a Companion to Bradshaw's Railway Tables. Map. Post 8vo, 10s.

Handbook—Eastern Counties; Chelmsford, Harwich, Colchester, Maldon, Cambridge, Ely, Newmarket, Bury, Ipswich, Woodbridge, Felixstowe, Lowestoft, Norwich, Yarmouth, Cromer. Map and Plans. Post 8vo, 12s.

Handbook — Kent; Canterbury, Dover, Ramsgate, Rochester, Chatham. Map and Plans. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Handbook—Sussex; Brighton, Eastbourne, Chichester, Hastings, Lewes, Arundel, etc. Map. Post 8vo, 6s.

Handbook—Surrey and Hants; Kingston, Croydon, Reigate, Guildford, Dorking, Boxhill, Winchester, Southampton, New Forest, Portsmouth, Isle of Wight. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 10s.

Handbook—Berks, Bucks, and Oxon; Windsor, Eton, Reading, Aylesbury, Henley, Oxford, Blenheim, and the Thames. Map and Plans. Post 8vo.

Handbook—Wilts, Dorset, and Somerset; Salisbury, Stonehenge, Chippenham, Weymouth, Sherborne, Wells, Bath, Bristol, etc. Map. Post 8vo, 10s.

Handbook—Devon; Exeter, Ilfracombe, Linton, Sidmouth, Dawlish, Teignmouth, Plymouth, Devonport, Torquay. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Handbook—Cornwall; Launceston, Penzance, Falmouth, The Lizard, Land's End. Maps. Post 8vo, 6s.

Handbook—Gloucester, Hereford, and Worcester; Cirencester, Cheltenham, Stroud, Tewkesbury, Leominster, Ross, Malvern, Kidderminster, Dudley, Evesham. Map. Post 8vo.

Handbook — North Wales; Bangor, Carnarvon, Beaumaris, Snowdon, Llanberis, Dolgelly, Cader Idris, Conway. Map. Post 8vo, 7s.

Handbook — South Wales; Monmouth, Llandaff, Merthyr, Vale of Neath, Pembroke, Carmarthen, Tenby, Swansea, the Wye. Map. Post 8vo, 7s.

Handbook—Derby, Notts, Leicester, and Stafford; Matlock, Bakewell, Chatsworth, The Peak, Buxton, Hardwick, Dovedale, Ashbourn, Southwell, Mansfield, Retford, Burton, Belvoir, Melton Mowbray, Wolverhampton, Lichfield, Tamworth. Map. Post 8vo, 9s.

Handbook—Shropshire & Cheshire, Shrewsbury, Ludlow, Bridgnorth, Oswestry, Chester, Crewe, Alderley, Stockport, Birkenhead. Maps and Plans Post 8vo, 6s.

Handbook—Lancashire; Warrington, Bury, Manchester, Liverpool, Burnley, Clitheroe, Bolton, Blackburn, Wigan, Preston, Rochdale, Lancaster, Southport, Blackpool. Map. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Handbook—Northamptonshire and Rutland; Northampton, Peterborough, Towcester, Daventry, Market Harborough, Kettering, Wallingborough, Thrapston, Stamford, Uppingham, Oakham. Maps. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Handbook—Yorkshire; Doncaster, Hull, Selby, Beverley, Scarborough, Whitby, Harrogate, Ripon, Leeds, Wakefield, Bradford, Halifax, Huddersfield, Sheffield. Map and Plans. Post 8vo, 12s.

Handbook — Durham and Northumberland; Newcastle, Darlington, Bishop Auckland, Stockton, Hartlepool, Sunderland, Shields, Berwick, Tynemouth, Alnwick. Map. Post 8vo, 9s.

Handbook—Westmorland and Cumberland; Lancaster, Furness Abbey, Ambleside, Kendal, Windermere, Coniston, Keswick, Grasmere, Ulswater, Carlisle, Cockermouth, Penrith, Appleby. Map. Post 8vo.

Travelling Map of the Lake District, 3s. 6d.

Handbook—Scotland; Edinburgh, Melrose, Abbotsford, Glasgow, Dumfries, Galloway, Ayr, Stirling, Arran, The Clyde, Oban, Inverary, Loch Lomond, Loch Katrine and Trossachs, Caledonian Canal, Inverness, Perth, Dundee, Aberdeen, Braemar, Skye, Caithness, Ross, and Sutherland. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 9s.

Handbook—Ireland; Dublin, Belfast, The Giant's Causeway, Bantry, Glengariff, etc., Donegal, Galway, Wexford, Cork, Limerick, Waterford, Killarney. Maps and Plans. Post 8vo, 10s.

Handbook—Herts, Beds, Warwick. Map. Post 8vo. [*In preparation.*

Handbook — Huntingdon and Lincoln. Map. Post 8vo. [*In preparation.*

ENGLISH CATHEDRALS.

Handbook — Southern Cathedrals. Winchester, Salisbury, Exeter, Wells, Rochester, Canterbury, Chichester, and St. Albans. Illustrations. 2 vols. Crown 8vo, 36s.

Handbook — Eastern Cathedrals. Oxford, Peterborough, Ely, Norwich, and Lincoln. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 21s.

Handbook — Western Cathedrals. Bristol, Gloucester, Hereford, Worcester, and Lichfield. With 60 Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 16s.

Handbook — Northern Cathedrals. York, Ripon, Durham, Carlisle, Chester, and Manchester. Illustrations. 2 vols. Crown 8vo, 21s.

Handbook—Welsh Cathedrals. Llandaff, St. David's, Bangor, and St. Asaph's. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 15s.

Handbook—St. Alban's Cathedral. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Handbook—St. Paul's. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

The Speaker's Commentary on THE BIBLE. Explanatory and Critical, With a Revision of the Translation. By Bishops and Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by Canon COOK. Medium 8vo. Old Test. : 6 vols., 135s. New Test. : 4 vols., 94s. *See p. 2, ante.*

The New Testament : Edited, with a short Practical Commentary, by Archdeacon CHURTON and Bishop BASIL JONES. With 100 Illustrations. 2 vols. Crown 8vo, 21s.

The Student's Edition of the Speaker's Commentary on the Bible. Abridged and Edited by JOHN M. FULLER, M.A. Crown 8vo. *See p. 2.*

Dictionary of the Bible ; its Antiquities, Biography, Geography, and Natural History. By various Writers. Edited by Dr. WM. SMITH. Illustrations. 3 vols. 8vo, 105s.

Concise Bible Dictionary. For the use of Students and Families. Condensed from the above. Maps and 300 Illustrations. 8vo, 21s.

Smaller Bible Dictionary ; for Schools and Young Persons. Abridged from the above. Maps and Woodcuts. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Dictionary of Christian Antiquities ; comprising the History, Institutions, and Antiquities of the Christian Church. Edited by Dr. WM. SMITH, and Archdeacon CHEETHAM. Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, £3 : 13 : 6.

Church Dictionary. By Dean HOOK. 8vo, 16s.

Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines ; from the Times of the Apostles to the Age of Charlemagne. Edited by Dr. WM. SMITH and Professor WACE. Vols. I. & II. 8vo, 31s. 6d. each.

A Dictionary of Hymnology ; A Companion to existing Hymn Books. Setting forth the Origin and History of the Hymns in the most popular Hymnals, together with Biographical Notices of their Authors and Translators, and their Sources and Origins. By Rev. JOHN JULIAN. 8vo.

The Student's Manual of English Church History. By Canon PERRY. *See p. 27.*

Student's Manual of Ecclesiastical History. By PHILIP SMITH, B.A. *See p. 27.*

Student's Old Testament History. From the Creation to the return of the Jews from Captivity. By P. SMITH. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's New Testament History. With an Introduction connecting the History of the Old and New Testaments. By PHILIP SMITH. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

History of Latin Christianity, including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of NICHOLAS V. By Dean MILMAN. 9 vols. crown 8vo, 54s.

The Gospel and its Witnesses. The Principal Facts in the Life of our Lord, and the Authority of the Evangelical Narratives. By HENRY WACE, M.A., Preacher of Lincoln's Inn, etc. Crown 8vo.

Book of Common Prayer ; with Historical Notes. By Rev. THOMAS JAMES. With Initial Letters, Vignettes, etc. 8vo, 18s.

A Book of Family Prayers : Selected from the Liturgy of the English Church. With Preface. By CHARLES E. POLLOCK. 16mo, 3s. 6d.

Signs and Wonders in the Land of HAM. With Ancient and Modern Parallels and Illustrations. By Rev. T. S. MILLINGTON. Woodcuts. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Talmud : Selected Extracts, chiefly Illustrating the Teaching of the Bible. With an Introduction. By Bishop BARCLAY. Illustrations. 8vo, 14s.

Notes on some Passages in the Liturgical History of the Reformed English Church. By Lord SELBORNE, 8vo, 6s.

History of the Christian Church from the Apostolic Age to the Reformation, A.D. 64-1517. By Canon ROBERTSON. 8 vols. post 8vo, 6s. each.

Undesigned Scriptural Coincidences in the Old and New Testaments; a Test of their Veracity. By Rev. J. J. BLUNT. Post 8vo, 6s.

History of the Christian Church in the First Three Centuries. By Rev. J. J. BLUNT. Post 8vo, 6s.

The Parish Priest; His Duties, Acquirements, and Obligations. By Rev. J. J. BLUNT. Post 8vo, 6s.

Biblical Researches in Palestine and the Adjacent Regions. A Journal of Travels and Researches. With Historical Illustrations. By EDWARD ROBINSON, D.D. Maps. 3 vols. 8vo, 42s.

Psalms of David; with Notes, Explanatory and Critical. By Dean JOHNSON, Canon ELLIOTT, and Canon COOK. Medium 8vo, 10s. 6d.

The Witness of the Psalms to Christ and Christianity. The Bampton Lectures for 1876. By the Bishop of DERRY. 8vo, 14s.

The Manifold Witness for Christ: being an Attempt to Exhibit the Combined Force of Various Evidences, Direct and Indirect, of Christianity. By Canon BARRY. 8vo, 12s.

University Sermons. By Rev. J. J. BLUNT. Post 8vo, 6s.

Church and the Age: a Series of Essays on the Principles and Present Position of the Anglican Church. By various Writers. 2 vols. 8vo, 26s.

The Synoptic Gospels,—The Death of Christ,—The Worth of Life,—Design in Nature, and other Essays. By Archbishop THOMSON. Cr. 8vo, 9s.

Companions for the Devout Life. Lectures delivered at St. James' Church. 1875-76. By Archb. of Dublin —Bps. of Ely and Derry—Deans of St. Paul's, Norwich, Chester, and Chichester—Canons Ashwell, Barry, and Farrar—Revs. Humphry, Carter, and Bickersteth. Post 8vo, 6s.

Classic Preachers of the English Church.

FIRST SERIES. 1877. Donne, Barrow, South, Beveridge, Wilson, Butler. With Introduction. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

SECOND SERIES. 1878. Bull, Horsley, Taylor, Sanderson, Tillotson, Andrewes. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Masters in English Theology. Lectures delivered at King's College, London. By Canon BARRY, Dean of St. Paul's, Prof. PLUMPTRE, Canons WESTCOTT and FARRAR, and Archdeacon CHEETHAM. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Essays on Cathedrals. By various Authors. Edited, with an Introduction, by Dean HOWSON. 8vo, 12s.

The Cathedral: its Necessary Place in the Life and Work of the Church. By the Bishop of TRURO. Crown 8vo, 6s.

The Outlook: a Charge delivered at his Primary Visitation, Nov. 1881. By the Bishop of ROCHESTER. Map. 8vo, 2s.

Should the Revised New Testament be Authorised? By Sir EDMUND BECKETT, Q.C. Post 8vo.

The Gallican Church. From the Concordat of Bologna, 1516, to the Revolution. With an introduction. By W. H. JERVIS. Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo, 28s.

Continuity of Scripture, as declared by the Testimony of Our Lord and of the Evangelists and Apostles. By Lord HATHERLEY. 8vo, 6s.; or cheap edition, 2s. 6d.

Bible Lands: their Modern Customs and Manners, illustrative of Scripture. By HENRY VAN LENNEP, D.D. Illustrations. 8vo, 21s.

The Shadows of a Sick Room. With Preface by Canon LIDDON. 16mo, 2s. 6d.

An Argument for the Divinity of Jesus Christ. From "Le Christianisme et les temps presents." By ABBE EM. BOUGAUD. Translated by C. L. CURRIE. Fcap. 8vo.

Manual of Family Prayer; arranged on a card. 8vo, 2s.

Treatise on the Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination. By Canon MOZLEY. Crown 8vo, 9s.

Foundations of Religion in the Mind and Heart of Man. By Sir JOHN BYLES. Post 8vo, 6s.

Hymns adapted to the Church Service. By Bishop HEBER. 16mo, 1s. 6d.

The Nicene and Apostles' CREEDS. Their Literary History, with some account of "The Creed of St. Athanasius." By Canon SWAINSON. 8vo, 16s.

The Limits of Religious Thought examined. Bampton Lectures By Dean MANSEL. Post 8vo, 8s. 6d

Christian Institutions; Essays on Ecclesiastical Subjects. By Dean STANLEY. 8vo. 12s.

Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians. The Greek Text; with Critical Notes and Dissertations. By Dean STANLEY. 8vo, 18s.

Lectures on the History of the EASTERN CHURCH. By Dean STANLEY. 8vo, 12s.

Lectures on the History of the JEWISH CHURCH. By Dean STANLEY. 1st and 2d SERIES, Abraham to the Captivity. Maps. 2 vols. 8vo, 24s. 3d SERIES, Captivity to the Christian Era. Maps. 8vo, 14s.

Sermons preached during the Tour of the Prince of Wales in the East. By Dean STANLEY. With Notices of the Localities visited. 8vo, 9s.

Sermons Preached in Westminster Abbey on Public Occasions. By the late Dean STANLEY. 8vo.

The Beatitudes: and other Sermons addressed to Children in Westminster Abbey. By the late Dean STANLEY. Fcap. 8vo.

Sermons preached in Lincoln's-Inn. By Canon COOK. 8vo, 9s.

Benedicite; or, Song of the Three Children. Being Illustrations of the Power, Beneficence, and Design manifested by the Creator in His Works. By G. C. CHILD CHAPLIN, M.D. Post 8vo, 6s.

Sermons preached at Lincoln's-Inn. By Archbp. THOMSON. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Life in the Light of God's Word. By Archbp. THOMSON. Post 8vo, 5s.

Life in Faith. Sermons preached at Cheltenham and Rugby. By T. W. JEX-BLAKE, D.D. Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

A History of Christianity, from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire. By Dean MILMAN. 3 vols. post 8vo, 18s.

History of the Jews, from the earliest period, continued to Modern Times. By Dean MILMAN. 3 vols. post 8vo, 18s.

A Smaller Scripture History of the Old and New Testaments. Edited by Dr. W. SMITH. Woodcuts. 16mo, 3s. 6d.

The Jesuits: their Constitution and Teaching; an Historical Sketch. By W. C. CARTWRIGHT. 8vo, 9s.

Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion. By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE. Containing The Vatican Decrees—Vaticanism—Speeches of Pius IX. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Eight Months at Rome, during the Vatican Council, with a Daily Account of the Proceedings. By POMPONIO LETO. 8vo, 12s.

Worship in the Church of ENGLAND. By A. J. B. BERESFORD-HOPE. 8vo, 9s.; *or, Popular Edition*, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

SCIENCE NATURAL HISTORY, GEOLOGY, ETC.

Science.

Connexion of the Physical Sciences. By MARY SOMERVILLE. New Edition. Revised by A. B. BUCKLEY. Plates. Post 8vo, 9s.

Molecular and Microscopic Science. By MARY SOMERVILLE. Illustrations. 2 vols. post 8vo, 21s.

Six Months in Ascension; an Unscientific Account of a Scientific Expedition. By Mrs. GILL. Map. Crown 8vo, 9s.

The Admiralty Manual of Scientific Inquiry, prepared for the use of Officers, and Travellers in General. Map. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Reports of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, from 1831 to the present time. 8vo.

Philosophy in Sport made Science in Earnest; or, the First Principles of Natural Philosophy explained by aid of the Toys and Sports of Youth. By Dr. PARIS. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Metallurgy; The Art of Extracting Metals from their Ores. By JOHN PERCY, F.R.S. With Illustrations. 8vo.

FUEL, WOOD, PEAT, COAL, &c. 30s.
LEAD, and Part of SILVER. 30s.
SILVER and GOLD, 30s.

The Manufacture of Russian Sheet-iron. By JOHN PERCY, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

A Manual of Naval Architecture for the Use of Officers of the Royal Navy, Mercantile Marine, Yachtsmen, Shipbuilders, and others. By W. H. WHITE. Illustrations. 8vo, 24s.

Ironclad Ships; their Qualities, Performances, and Cost, with Chapters on Turret Ships, Rams, &c. By Sir E. J. REED, C.B. Illustrations. 8vo, 12s.

Natural Philosophy; an Introduction to the study of Statics, Dynamics, Hydrostatics, Light, Heat, and Sound; with numerous Examples. By SAMUEL NEWTH. Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

The Freedom of Science in the Modern State. By RUDOLF VIRCHOW. Fcp. 8vo, 2s.

Mathematical Examples. A Graduated Series of Elementary Examples in Arithmetic, Algebra, Logarithms, Trigonometry, and Mechanics. By SAMUEL NEWTH. Small 8vo, 8s. 6d.

Elements of Mechanics, including Hydrostatics, with numerous Examples. By SAMUEL NEWTH. Small 8vo, 8s. 6d.

Patterns for Turning; to be cut on the Lathe *without* the use of *any* Ornamental Chuck. By W. H. ELPHINSTONE. Illustrations. Small 4to, 15s.

Natural History and Medicine.

Siberia in Europe. A Naturalist's Visit to the Valley of the Petchora in North-East Russia. With Notices of Birds and their Migrations. By HENRY SEEBOHM. Map and Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 14s.

Life of a Scotch Naturalist (THOMAS EDWARD). By S. SMILES. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

The Cat; an Introduction to the Study of Backboned Animals, especially Mammals. By ST. GEORGE MIVART. With 200 Illustrations. 8vo, 30s.

Lessons from Nature; as manifested in Mind and Matter. By ST. GEORGE MIVART, F.R.S. 8vo, 16s.

The Origin of Species, by MEANS OF NATURAL SELECTION; or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. By CHARLES DARWIN. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Voyage of a Naturalist; a Journal of Researches into the Natural History and Geology of the Countries visited during a Voyage round the World. By CHARLES DARWIN. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 9s.

Variation of Animals and Plants UNDER DOMESTICATION. By C. DARWIN. Illustrations. 2 vols. cr. 8vo, 18s.

The Various Contrivances by which ORCHIDS are FERTILISED by INSECTS. By CHARLES DARWIN. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 9s.

The Effects of Cross and Self Fertilisation in the Vegetable Kingdom. By CHARLES DARWIN. Crown 8vo, 12s.

Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals. By CHARLES DARWIN. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 12s.

Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex. By CHARLES DARWIN. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 9s.

Insectivorous Plants. By CHARLES DARWIN. Post 8vo, 14s.

The Movements and Habits of Climbing Plants. By CHAS. DARWIN. Post 8vo, 6s.

The Different Forms of Flowers on Plants of the same Species. By CHARLES DARWIN. Woodcuts. Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

The Power of Movement in Plants. By CHARLES DARWIN, assisted by FRANCIS DARWIN. Woodcuts. Crown 8vo, 15s.

The Formation of Vegetable Mould through the Action of Worms. With Observations on their Habits. By CHARLES DARWIN. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 9s.

Facts and Arguments for Darwin. By FRITZ MULLER. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 5s.

Geographical Handbook of all the known Ferns, with Tables to show their Distribution. By K. M. LYELL. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Gardens of the Sun; or, a Naturalist's Journal on the Mountains and in the Forests and Swamps of Borneo and the Sulu Archipelago. By F. W. BURBIDGE. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 14s.

Harvest of the Sea. An Account of the British Food Fishes. With Sketches of Fisheries and Fisher-Folk. By JAMES G. BERTRAM. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 9s.

Household Surgery; or, Hints for Emergencies. By JOHN F. SOUTH. With new Preface and Additions. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Kirkes' Handbook of Physiology. By W. MORRANT BAKER. 420 Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 14s.

Gleanings in Natural History. By EDWARD JESSE. Woodcuts. Fcap. 3s. 6d.

Geography and Geology.

Student's Elements of Geology. By Sir CHARLES LYELL. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 9s.

Principles of Geology; or, the Modern Changes of the Earth and its Inhabitants, as Illustrative of Geology. By Sir CHARLES LYELL. Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo, 32s.

Physical Geography. By MARY SOMERVILLE. New Edition, Revised by Rev. J. RICHARDSON. Portrait. Post 8vo, 9s.

Physical Geography of the Holy Land. By EDWARD ROBINSON, Post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Siluria; a History of the Oldest FOSSILIFEROUS ROCKS and their Foundations; with a Brief Sketch of the Distribution of Gold over the Earth. By Sir RODERICK MURCHISON. Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, 18s.

Records of the Rocks; or, Notes on the Geology, Natural History, and Antiquities of North and South Wales, Devon, &c. By Rev. W. S. SYMONDS. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 12s.

Life of a Scotch Geologist and Botanist (ROBERT DICK). By S. SMILES. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 12s.

Scepticism in Geology, and the Reasons for it. An assemblage of Facts from Nature opposed to the Theory of "Causes now in Action," and refuting it. By VERIFIER. Post 8vo, 6s.

FINE ARTS, ARCHITECTURE, & ANTIQUITIES.

The National Memorial to the PRINCE CONSORT at KENSINGTON. A Descriptive and Illustrated Account, consisting of Coloured Views and Engravings of the Monument and its Decorations, its Groups, Statues, Mosaics, Architecture, and Metalwork. With descriptive text by DOYNE C. BELL. Folio, £12:12s.

A Handbook to the Albert Memorial. Fcap. 8vo, 1s.; or with Illustrations, 2s. 6d.

Mediæval and Modern Pottery and PORCELAIN. By JOSEPH MARRYAT. Illustrations. Medium 8vo, 42s.

Old English Plate: Ecclesiastical, Decorative, and Domestic; its Makers and Marks. With Illustrations and Improved Tables of the Date Letters used in England, Scotland, and Ireland. By WILFRED J. CRIPPS. 70s. Illustrations. Medium 8vo, 16s.

Old French Plate: Furnishing Tables of the Paris Date Letters, and Facsimiles of other marks. By W. J. CRIPPS. With Illustrations. 8vo, 8s. 6d.

Cyprus; its Ancient Cities, Tombs, and Temples. A Narrative of Researches and Excavations during Ten Years' Residence in that Island. By LOUIS P. DI CESNOLA. 400 Illustrations. Medium 8vo, 50s.

A History of Greek Sculpture, from the Earliest Times down to the age of Pheidias. By A. S. MURRAY. With Illustrations. Royal 8vo, 21s.

Ancient Mycenæ; Discoveries and Researches on the Sites of Mycenæ and Tiryns. By Dr. SCHLIEMANN. With Preface by the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE. 500 Illustrations. Medium 8vo, 50s.

Ilios; a Complete History of the City and Country of the Trojans, including all Recent Discoveries and Researches made on the Site of Troy and the Troad in 1871-3 and 1878-9. With an Autobiography of the Author. By Dr. SCHLIEMANN. With nearly 2000 Illustrations. Imperial 8vo, 50s.

Nile Gleanings: the Ethnology, History, and Art of Ancient Egypt, as Revealed by Paintings and Bas-Reliefs. With Descriptions of Nubia and its Great Rock Temples to the Second Cataract. By VILLIERS STUART. With 50 Coloured Plates. Royal 8vo, 31s. 6d.

The Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria. By GEORGE DENNIS. 200 Illustrations. 2 vols. medium 8vo, 42s.

History of Painting in North Italy, 14th to 16th Century. Venice, Padua, Vicenza, Verona, Ferrara, Milan, Friuli, Breschia. By CROWE and CAVALCASELLE. Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, 42s.

Titian: his Life and Times. By CROWE and CAVALCASELLE. Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, 21s.

Handbook to the Italian Schools of Painting; Based on the work of Kugler. Revised by Lady EASTLAKE. 140 Illustrations. 2 vols. crown 8vo, 30s.

Handbook to the German, Dutch, and Flemish Schools of Painting. Based on the work of Kugler. Revised by J. A. CROWE. 60 Illustrations. 2 vols. post 8vo, 24s.

Lives of the Italian Painters; and the Progress of Painting in Italy. Cimabue to Bassano. By Mrs. JAMESON. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 12s.

Lives of the Early Flemish Painters, with Notices of their Works. By CROWE and CAVALCASELLE. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.; or large paper, 8vo, 15s.

Albert Dürer; a History of his Life and Works. By MORIZ THAUSING, Vienna. Edited by F. A. EATON, Secretary of the Royal Academy. With Portrait and Illustrations. 2 vols. Med. 8vo, 42s.

The Cicerone; or, Art Guide to Painting in Italy. By Dr. BURCKHARDT. Post 8vo, 6s.

History of Architecture in all COUNTRIES, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. By JAMES FERGUSSON. With 1600 Illustrations. 4 vols. Medium 8vo.
I. & II. Ancient and Mediæval, 63s.
III. Indian and Eastern, 42s.
IV. Modern, 31s. 6d.

Rude Stone Monuments in all COUNTRIES: their Age and Uses. By JAMES FERGUSSON. Illustrations. Medium 8vo, 24s.

The Temples of the Jews and other Buildings in the Haram Area at Jerusalem. By JAMES FERGUSSON. Illustrations. 4to, 42s.

Leaves from My Sketch-Book, By E. W. COOKE, R.A. 50 Plates. With Descriptive Text. 2 vols. Small folio, 31s. 6d. each. 1st SERIES, Paris, Arles, Monaco, Nuremberg, Switzerland, Rome, Egypt, etc. 2d SERIES, Venice, Naples, Pompeii, Poestum, the Nile, etc.

The Holy Sepulchre and the Temple at Jerusalem. By JAS. FERGUSSON. Woodcuts. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Life of Michel Angelo, Sculptor, Painter, and Architect, including unedited Documents in the Buonarroti Archives, by CHARLES HEATH WILSON. With Index and Illustrations. 8vo, 15s.

A Descriptive Catalogue of the Etched Work of Rembrandt; with Life and Introductions. By CHAS. H. MIDDLETON. Plates. Medium 8vo, 31s. 6d.

The Rise and Development of Mediæval Architecture. By Sir G. GILBERT SCOTT. 450 Illustrations. 2 vols. Medium 8vo, 42s.

Secular and Domestic Architecture. By Sir G. SCOTT, R.A. 8vo, 9s.

The Gothic Architecture of ITALY. By G. E. STREET, R.A. Illustrations. Royal 8vo, 26s.

The Gothic Architecture of SPAIN. By G. E. STREET, R.A. Illustrations. Royal 8vo, 30s.

The Rise of Styles in Architecture. By G. E. STREET, R.A. Illustrations. 8vo.

Notes on the Churches of Kent. By Sir STEPHEN GLYNNE. With a Preface by W. H. GLADSTONE. Illustrations. 8vo, 12s.

Handbooks to English Cathedrals. *See p. 14.*

Purity in Musical Art. By A. F. J. THIBAUT. With Memoir by W. H. GLADSTONE. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Handbook for Young Painters. By C. R. LESLIE. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Life and Times of Sir Joshua Reynolds, with notices of his Contemporaries. By C. R. LESLIE and TOM TAYLOR. Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo, 42s.

Lectures on Architecture. Delivered before the Royal Academy. By EDWARD M. BARRY, R.A. Edited with Memoir by Canon BARRY. Portrait and Illustrations. 8vo, 16s.

Contributions to the Literature OF THE FINE ARTS. By Sir C. LOCK EASTLAKE, R.A. With a Memoir by Lady EASTLAKE. 2 vols. 8vo, 24s.

School Architecture. Practical Information on the Planning, Designing, Building, and Furnishing of School-houses, etc. By E. R. ROBSON. Illustrations. Medium 8vo, 18s.

The Choice of a Dwelling; a Practical Handbook of useful information on all points connected with a House. Plans. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Life of Sir Charles Barry, R.A., Architect. By Canon BARRY. Illustrations. Medium 8vo, 15s.

London—Past and Present: alphabetically arranged. By PETER CUNNINGHAM. A new and revised edition. 3 vols. 8vo. [*In the Press.*

PHILOSOPHY, LAW, AND POLITICS.

The Eastern Question. By Viscount STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE, Being a Selection from his Recent Writings. With a Preface by Dean STANLEY. Post 8vo, 9s.

Letters on the Politics of Switzerland, pending the outbreak of the Civil War in 1847. By GEORGE GROTE. 8vo, 6s.

Constitutional Progress. A Series of Lectures. By MONTAGUE BURROWS. Post 8vo, 5s.

Constitution and Practice of Courts-Martial. By Capt. SIMMONS. 8vo, 15s.

Administration of Justice under Military and Martial Law, as applicable to the Army, Navy, Marine, and Auxiliary Forces. By C. M. CLODE. 8vo, 12s.

Student's Blackstone. A Systematic Abridgment of the entire Commentaries. By R. MALCOLM KERR. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Communistic Societies of the United States. With Accounts of the Shakers and other Societies; their Creeds, Social Practices, Industries, etc. By C. NORDHOFF. Illustrations. 8vo, 15s.

The English Constitution; its Rise, Growth, and Present State. By DAVID ROWLAND. Post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Laws of Nature the Foundation of Morals. By DAVID ROWLAND. Post 8vo, 6s.

A Handbook to the Political Questions of the day, with the Arguments on Either Side. By SYDNEY C. BUXTON. 8vo, 6s.

A Manual of Moral Philosophy. With Quotations and References. By WILLIAM FLEMING. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Gleanings of Past Years, 1843-78. By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. Small 8vo, 2s. 6d. each. I. The Throne, Prince Consort, Cabinet, and Constitution. II. Personal and Literary. III. Historical and Speculative. IV. Foreign. V. and VI. Ecclesiastical. VII. Miscellaneous.

Speeches and Addresses, Political and Literary. Delivered in the House of Lords, in Canada, and elsewhere. By the Right Hon. the EARL OF DUFFERIN. 8vo.

Philosophy of the Moral Feelings. By JOHN ABERCROMBIE. Fcap. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

The Intellectual Powers, and the Investigation of Truth. By JOHN ABERCROMBIE. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Hortensius; an Historical Essay on the Office and Duties of an Advocate. By WILLIAM FORSYTH. Illustrations. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Lectures on General Jurisprudence; or, the Philosophy of Positive Law. By JOHN AUSTIN. Edited by ROBERT CAMPBELL. 2 vols. 8vo, 32s.

Student's Edition of Austin's Lectures on Jurisprudence. Compiled from the larger work. By ROBERT CAMPBELL. Post 8vo, 12s.

An Analysis of Austin's Jurisprudence for the Use of Students. By GORDON CAMPBELL, M.A. Post 8vo, 6s.

England and Russia in the East. A Series of Papers on the Political and Geographical Condition of Central Asia. By Sir H. RAWLINSON. Map. 8vo, 12s.

Ancient Law: its Connection with the Early History of Society, and its Relation to Modern Ideas. By Sir HENRY S. MAINE. 8vo, 12s.

Village Communities in the East and West. By Sir HENRY S. MAINE. 8vo, 12s.

The Early History of Institutions. By Sir HENRY MAINE. 8vo, 12s.

Local Taxation of Great Britain and Ireland. By R. H. I. PALGRAVE. 8vo, 5s.

Plato and other Companions of Socrates. By GEORGE GROTE. 3 vols. 8vo, 45s.

Artistotle. By GEORGE GROTE. Second Edition. With Additions. 8vo, 18s.

Minor Works of George Grote. With Critical Remarks on his Intellectual Character, Writings, and Speeches. By ALEX. BAIN. Portrait. 8vo, 14s.

The Bengal Famine. How it will be Met, and how to Prevent Future Famines. By Sir BARTLE FRERE. Maps. Crown 8vo, 5s.

India in 1880. By Sir R. TEMPLE. 8vo, 16s.

Men and Events of my Time in India. By Sir RICHARD TEMPLE, Bart. 8vo.

Results of Indian Missions. By Sir BARTLE FRERE. Small 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Eastern Africa viewed as a Field for Mission Labour. By Sir BARTLE FRERE. Crown 8vo, 5s.

The Lex Salica; The Ten Texts, With the Glosses and the Lex Emendata. Synoptically Edited by J. H. HESSELS. With Notes on the Frankish Words in the Lex Salica by Professor KERN. 4to, 42s.

Researches into the Early History of Mankind, and the Development of Civilisation. By E. B. TYLOR. 8vo, 12s.

Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom. By E. B. TYLOR. 2 vols. 8vo, 24s.

Ricardo's Political Works. With a Biographical Sketch. By J. R. M'CULLOCH. 8vo, 16s.

The Moral Philosophy of Aristotle. Consisting of a Translation of the Nicomachean Ethics, and of the Paraphrase attributed to Andronicus of Rhodes; with Introductory Analysis of each Book. By the late WALTER M. HATCH, M.A. 8vo, 18s.

History of British Commerce, and of the Economic Progress of the Nation, 1763–1878. By LEONE LEVI. 8vo, 18s.

Ideas of the Day on Policy. By CHARLES BUXTON. 8vo, 6s.

Judgments of the Privy Council, with an Historical Account of the Appellate Jurisdiction in the Church of England. By G. C. BRODRICK and W. H. FREMANTLE. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

A Little Light on the Cretan Question. By A. F. YULE. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

History of the English Poor Laws. By Sir G. NICHOLLS. 2 vols. 8vo.

Consolation in Travel; or, the Last Days of a Philosopher. By Sir HUMPHRY DAVY. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

GENERAL LITERATURE AND PHILOLOGY.

The Quarterly Review. 8vo, 6s.

Prince Albert's Speeches and Addresses on Public Occasions; with an outline of his Character. Portrait. Fcap. 8vo, 1s.

The Modern Ducange. A New Mediæval Latin-English Dictionary, occupying the ground of Ducange, but Edited in accordance with the Modern Science of Philology. By E. A. DAYMAN, B.D., Prebendary of Sarum, formerly Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford, and J. H. HESSELS. Small 4to.

The Talmud and other Literary Remains of EMANUEL DEUTSCH. With a Memoir. 8vo, 12s.

Letters, Lectures, and Reviews, including the Phrontisterion, or Oxford in the 19th Century. By Dean MANSEL. 8vo, 12s.

The Novels and Novelists of the 18th Century; in Illustration of the Manners and Morals of the Age. By WM. FORSYTH. Post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Principles of Greek Etymology. By Professor CURTIUS. Translated by A. S. WILKINS, M.A., and E. B. ENGLAND, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo, 15s. each.

The Greek Verb. Its Structure and Development. By Professor CURTIUS. Translated by A. S. WILKINS and E. B. ENGLAND. 8vo, 18s.

Miscellanies. By Earl STANHOPE. 2 vols. post 8vo, 13s.

Historical Essays. By Earl STANHOPE. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

French Retreat from Moscow, and other Essays. By the late Earl STANHOPE. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Papers of a Critic. Selected from the Writings of the late C. W. DILKE. 2 vols. 8vo, 24s.

Gleanings of Past Years. I. The Throne, Prince Consort, Cabinet, and Constitution. II. Personal and Literary. III. Historical and Speculative. IV. Foreign. V. and VI. Ecclesiastical. VII. Miscellaneous. By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. Small 8vo. 2s. 6d. each.

Lavengro: the Scholar—the Gipsy—and the Priest. By GEORGE BORROW. Post 8vo, 5s.

The Romany Rye: a Sequel to 'Lavengro.' By GEORGE BORROW. Post 8vo, 5s.

Wild Wales: its People, Language, and Scenery. By GEORGE BORROW. Post 8vo, 5s.

Romano Lavo-Lil; Word-Book of the Romany, or English Gypsy Language; with an Account of certain Gypsyries. By GEORGE BORROW. Post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Field Paths and Green Lanes: Country Walks, chiefly in Surrey and Sussex. By L. J. JENNINGS. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Rambles among the Hills; or Walks in the Peak of Derbyshire and in the South Downs. By L. J. JENNINGS. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 12s.

Old Deccan Days: Hindoo Fairy Legends current in Southern India. Collected by MARY FRERE. With Introduction by Sir BARTLE FRERE. Illustrations. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Livonian Tales. By a LADY. Post 8vo, 2s.

The Amber-Witch: a Trial for Witchcraft. Translated by Lady DUFF GORDON. Post 8vo, 2s.

The Handwriting of Junius. Professionally investigated by C. CHABOT. Edited by the Hon. EDWARD TWISLETON. With Facsimiles. 4to, 63s.

The Literary History of Europe. By HENRY HALLAM. Library edition, 3 vols. 8vo, 36s.; or Cabinet edition, 4 vols. post 8vo, 16s.

English Studies: Essays by the late Rev. J. S. BREWER. 8vo, 14s.

Stokers and Pokers, or the London and North-Western Railway. By Sir F. HEAD. Post 8vo, 2s.

Specimens of the Table-Talk of SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE. Portrait. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

The Remains in Prose and Verse of Arthur Hallam. With Memoir. Portrait. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Self-Help. With Illustrations of Conduct and Perseverance. By Dr. SMILES. Small 8vo, 6s.

Character. A Book of Noble Characteristics. By Dr. SMILES. Small 8vo, 6s.

Thrift. A Book of Domestic Counsel. By Dr. SMILES. Post 8vo, 6s.

Duty, with Illustrations of Courage, Patience, and Endurance. By Dr. S. SMILES. Post 8vo, 6s.

Mottoes for Monuments; or, Epitaphs selected for General Study and Application. By Mrs. PALLISER. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Words of Human Wisdom. Collected and Arranged by E. S. With Preface by Canon LIDDON. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Æsop's Fables. A new Version. With Historical Preface. By Rev. THOMAS JAMES. Woodcuts, by TENNIEL. Post 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Letters from the Baltic. By a LADY. Post 8vo, 2s.

Literary Essays from the 'Times.' By SAMUEL PHILLIPS. Portrait. 2 vols. fcap. 8vo, 7s.

Rejected Addresses. By JAMES and HORACE SMITH. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.; or fcap. 8vo, 1s.

Lispings from Low Latitudes; or, the Journal of the Hon. Impulsia Gushington. Edited by Lord DUFFERIN. Plates. 4to, 21s.

An English Grammar. Methodical, Analytical, and Historical. With a Treatise on the Orthography, Prosody, Inflections, and Syntax of the English Tongue. By Professor MAETZNER. 3 vols. 8vo, 36s.

POETRY, THE DRAMA, ETC.

The Prose and Poetical Works of Lord Byron. With Notes by SCOTT, JEFFREY, WILSON, GIFFORD, CRABBE, HEBER, LOCKHART, etc., and Notices of his Life. By THOMAS MOORE. Illustrations. 2 vols. royal 8vo, 15s.

Poetical Works of Lord Byron. Library Edition. Portrait. 6 vols. 8vo, 45s.

Poetical Works of Lord Byron. Cabinet Edition. Plates. 10 vols. fcap. 8vo, 30s.

Poetical Works of Lord Byron. Pocket Edition. 8 vols. bound and in a case. 18mo, 21s.

Poetical Works of Lord Byron. Popular Edition. Plates. Royal 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Poetical Works of Lord Byron. Pearl Edition. Post 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Childe Harold. By Lord Byron. 80 Engravings. Crown 8vo, 12s.

Childe Harold. By Lord Byron. 2s. 6d., 1s., and 6d. each.

Tales and Poems. By Lord Byron. 24mo, 2s. 6d.

Miscellanies. By Lord Byron. 2 vols. 24mo, 5s.

Dramas. By Lord Byron. 2 vols. 24mo, 5s.

Don Juan and Beppo. By Lord Byron. 2 vols. 24mo, 5s.

Beauties of Byron. Prose and Verse. Portrait. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Oliver Goldsmith's Works, edited by PETER CUNNINGHAM. Vignettes. 4 vols. 8vo, 30s.

Agamemnon. Translated from Æschylus. By the Earl of CARNARVON. Small 8vo, 6s.

Argo; or, the Quest of the Golden Fleece, a Metrical Tale in ten books. By the Earl of CRAWFORD and BALCARRES. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Vie de Seint Auban: a Poem in Norman-French, ascribed to Matthew Paris. Edited, with Notes, by ROBERT ATKINSON. Small 4to, 10s. 6d.

The Vaux-de-Vire of Maistre Jean le Houx, Advocate of Vire. Translated by J. P. MUIRHEAD. Illustrations. 8vo, 21s.

Life and Poetical Works of Rev. George Crabbe. Plates, royal 8vo, 7s.

Life and Works of Alexander Pope. Edited by Rev. W. ELWIN and W. J. COURTHOPE. Portraits. vols. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8. 8vo, 10s. 6d. each.

Iliad of Homer. Translated into English blank verse. By the Earl of DERBY. Portrait. 2 vols. post 8vo, 10s.

The Odyssey of Homer. Rendered into English Verse. VOL. I.: Books I.—XII. VOL. II.: Books XIII. —XXIV. By General SCHOMBERG, C.B. 8vo, 12s. each.

Poetical Works of Bishop Heber. Portrait. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Hymns adapted to the Church Service. By Bishop HEBER. 16mo, 1s. 6d.

The Sonnet; its Origin, Structure, and Place in Poetry. With Translations from Dante and Petrarch. By CHARLES TOMLINSON. Post 8vo, 9s.

The Fall of Jerusalem. By Dean MILMAN. Fcap. 8vo, 1s.

Horace. By Dean MILMAN. Illustrated with 100 Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Ancient Spanish Ballads. Historical and Romantic. Translated by J. G. LOCKHART. Woodcuts. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Remains in Prose and Verse of Arthur Hallam. With Memoir. Portrait. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Rejected Addresses. By JAMES and HORACE SMITH. With Biographical Notices. Portraits. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.; or fcap. 8vo, 1s.

An Essay on English Poetry. With short lives of the British Poets. By THOMAS CAMPBELL. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Poems and Fragments of Catullus. Translated in the Metres of the Original. By ROBINSON ELLIS. 16mo, 5s.

Poetical Works of Lord Houghton. New Edition. 2 vols. fcap. 8vo, 12s.

Gongora's Poetical Works. With an Historical Essay on the Age of Philip III. and IV. of Spain. By Archdeacon CHURTON. Portrait. 2 vols. small 8vo, 12s.

Poetical Remains of the late Archdeacon Churton. Post 8vo, 2s. 6d.

NAVAL AND MILITARY WORKS.

Army List. (Published by Authority.) With an Alphabetical Index. Monthly. 16mo, 2s.

The Official Army List. With an Index. 8vo, 15s. Published Quarterly.

Navy List. (Published by Authority.) Quarterly, 16mo, 3s. Monthly, 1s. 6d.

Nautical Almanack. (Published by Authority.) 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Hart's Army List. (Published Quarterly and Annually.) 8vo.

Admiralty Publications, issued by direction of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty.

Admiralty Manual of Scientific Enquiry, for the use of Travellers. Edited by Sir J. HERSCHEL and ROBERT MAIN. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

A Dictionary of Naval and Military Technical Terms. English-French, French-English. By Colonel BURN. Crown 8vo, 15s.

Our Ironclad Ships: their Qualities, Performances, and Cost, including Chapters on Turret Ships, Ironclad Rams, etc. By E. J. REED, C.B. Illustrations. 8vo, 12s.

Manual of Naval Architecture for Officers of the Royal Navy, Mercantile Marine, Yachtsmen, Shipowners, and Shipbuilders. By W. H. WHITE. With 130 Woodcuts. 8vo, 24s.

Modern Warfare as Influenced by Modern Artillery. By Col. P. L. MACDOUGALL. Plans. Post 8vo, 12s.

Naval Gunnery; for the Use of Officers and the Training of Seaman Gunners. By Sir HOWARD DOUGLAS. 8vo, 21s.

The Royal Engineer and the Royal Establishments at Woolwich and Chatham. By Sir FRANCIS B. HEAD. Illustrations. 8vo, 12s.

The Principles and Practice of Modern Artillery, including Artillery Material, Gunnery, and Organisation and Use of Artillery in Warfare. By Lieut.-Col. C. H. OWEN. Illustrations. 8vo, 15s.

The Administration of Justice under Military and Martial Law, as applicable to the Army, Navy, Marine, and Auxiliary Forces. By C. M. CLODE. 8vo, 12s.

History of the Administration and Government of the British Army from the Revolution of 1688. By C. M. CLODE. 2 vols. 8vo, 21s. each.

Constitution and Practice of Courts-Martial, with a Summary of the Law of Evidence, and some Notice of the Criminal Law of England with reference to the Trial of Civil Offences. By Capt. T. F. SIMMONS, R.A. 8vo, 15s.

History of the Royal Artillery. Compiled from the Original Records. By Major FRANCIS DUNCAN, R.A. 2 vols. 8vo, 18s.

The English in Spain. The True Story of the War of the Succession in 1834-1840. Compiled from the Reports of the British Commissioners with Queen Isabella's Armies. By Major FRANCIS DUNCAN, R.A. Illustrations. 8vo, 16s.

Wellington's Supplementary Despatches and Correspondence. Edited by his SON. 15 vols. 8vo, 20s. each. An index. 8vo, 20s.

Wellington's Civil and Political Correspondence, 1819-1831. 8 vols. 8vo, 20s. each.

The Light Cavalry Brigade in the Crimea: Extracts from Letters and Journals during the Crimean War. By General Lord GEORGE PAGET. With Map. Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Lives of the Warriors of the Seventeenth Century. By Gen. Sir EDWARD CUST. 6 vols. post 8vo. *1st Series.*—THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR, 1600-48. 2 vols. 16s. *2d Series.*—THE CIVIL WARS OF FRANCE AND ENGLAND. 1611-75. 2 vols. 16s. *3d Series.*—COMMANDERS OF FLEETS AND ARMIES, 1648-1704. 2 vols. 18s.

Annals of the Wars of the 18th and 19th Centuries, 1700-1815. Compiled from the most Authentic Histories of the Period. By Gen. Sir E. CUST. Maps. 9 vols. fcap. 8vo, 5s. each.

Deeds of Naval Daring; or, Anecdotes of the British Navy. By EDWARD GIFFARD. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

RURAL AND DOMESTIC ECONOMY, ETC.

A Popular Account of the Introduction of Peruvian Bark from South America into British India and Ceylon, and of the Progress of its Cultivation. By CLEMENTS R. MARKHAM. With Maps and Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 14s.

Plain Instructions in Gardening; with a Calendar of Operations and Directions for every Month. By Mrs. LOUDON. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

A Geographical Handbook of FERNS. By K. M. LYELL. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Alpine Flowers for English GARDENS. How they may be grown in all parts of the British Islands. By W. ROBINSON. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Illustrated Wild Garden; or, Our Groves and Gardens made Beautiful by the Naturalisation of Hardy Exotic Plants. By W. ROBINSON. With 90 Woodcuts. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Sub-Tropical Garden; or, Beauty of Form in the Flower Garden, with Illustrations of all the finer Plants used for this purpose. By W. ROBINSON. Illustrations. Small 8vo, 5s.

Modern Domestic Cookery, Founded on Principles of Economy and Practice, and adapted for private families. By a LADY. Fcap. 8vo, 5s.

Thrift: a Book of Domestic Counsel. By SAMUEL SMILES. Small 8vo, 6s.

Duty: With Illustrations of Courage, Patience, and Endurance. By SAMUEL SMILES. Small 8vo, 6s.

Royal Agricultural Journal (published half-yearly). 8vo.

Bees and Flowers. By Rev. THOMAS JAMES. Fcap. 8vo, 1s. each.

Music and Dress. By a LADY. Fcap. 8vo, 1s.

Choice of a Dwelling; a Practical Handbook of Useful Information on all Points connected with Hiring, Buying, or Building a House. Plans. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Household Surgery; or Hints for Emergencies. By JOHN F. SOUTH. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

FIELD SPORTS.

Dog-breaking; the most Expeditious, Certain, and Easy Method. By General HUTCHINSON. Woodcuts. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

My Boyhood: a Story of Country Life and Sport for Boys. By H. C. BARKLEY, Civil Engineer. With Illustrations. Post 8vo, 6s.

Wild Sports and Natural History of the Highlands. By CHARLES ST. JOHN. New and Beautifully Illustrated Edition. Crown 8vo. 15s.; or cheap ed., post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

The Chase—The Turf—and the ROAD. By NIMROD. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 5s.; or coloured plates, 7s. 6d.

Salmonia; or Days of Fly-Fishing. By Sir HUMPHRY DAVY. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Horse-Shoeing; as it is, and as it should be. By WILLIAM DOUGLAS. Plates. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Five Years' Adventures in the far Interior of South Africa with the Wild Beasts and Wild Tribes of the Forests. By R. GORDON CUMMING. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 6s.

Sport and War. Recollections of Fighting and Hunting in South Africa, from 1834-67, with an Account of the Duke of Edinburgh's Visit. By General Sir JOHN BISSET, C.B. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 14s.

Western Barbary, its Wild Tribes and Savage Animals. By Sir JOHN DRUMMOND HAY. Post 8vo, 2s.

Sport in Abyssinia. By Earl of MAYO. Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 12s.

EDUCATIONAL WORKS.

DR. WM. SMITH'S DICTIONARIES.

A Dictionary of the Bible; Its Antiquities, Biography, Geography, and Natural History. Illustrations. 3 vols. 8vo, 105s.

A Concise Bible Dictionary. For the use of Students and Families. Condensed from the above. With Maps and 300 Illustrations. 8vo, 21s.

A Smaller Bible Dictionary. For Schools and Young Persons. Abridged from the above. With Maps and Woodcuts. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities. The History, Institutions, and Antiquities of the Christian Church. With Illustrations. 2 vols. medium 8vo, £3 : 13 : 6.

A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines. From the Time of the Apostles to the Age of Charlemagne. Vols. I. II. and III. Medium 8vo, 31s. 6d. each.

A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. Comprising the Laws, Institutions, Domestic Usages, Painting, Sculpture, Music, the Drama, etc. With 500 Illustrations. Medium 8vo, 28s.

A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, containing a History of the Ancient World, Civil, Literary, and Ecclesiastical, from the earliest times to the capture of Constantinople by the Turks. With 564 Illustrations. 3 vols. medium 8vo, 84s.

A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography, showing the Researches of modern Scholars and Travellers, including an account of the Political History of both Countries and Cities, as well as of their Geography. With 530 Illustrations. 2 vols. medium 8vo, 56s.

A Classical Dictionary of Mythology, Biography, and Geography. With 750 Woodcuts. 8vo, 18s.

A Smaller Classical Dictionary. Abridged from the above. With 200 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

A Smaller Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. Abridged from the larger work. With 200 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

A Latin-English Dictionary. Based on the works of Forcellini and Freund. With Tables of the Roman Calendar, Measures, Weights, and Monies. Medium 8vo, 21s.

A Smaller Latin-English Dictionary. With Dictionary of Proper Names, and Tables of Roman Calendar, etc. Abridged from the above. Square 12mo, 7s. 6d.

An English-Latin Dictionary, Copious and Critical. Medium 8vo, 21s.

A Smaller English-Latin Dictionary. Abridged from the above. Square 12mo, 7s. 6d.

DR. WM. SMITH'S SMALLER HISTORIES.

A Smaller Scripture History of the Old and New Testaments. Woodcuts. 16mo, 3s. 6d.

A Smaller Ancient History of the East, from the Earliest Times to the Conquest of Alexander the Great. With 70 Woodcuts. 16mo, 3s. 6d.

A Smaller History of Greece, from the Earliest Times to the Roman Conquest. With Coloured Maps and 74 Woodcuts. 16mo, 3s. 6d.

A Smaller History of Rome, from the Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Empire. With Coloured Map and Woodcuts. 16mo, 3s. 6d.

A Smaller Classical Mythology. With Translations from the Ancient Poets, and Questions on the Work. With 90 Woodcuts. 16mo, 3s. 6d.

A Smaller Manual of Ancient Geography. 36 Woodcuts. 16mo, 3s. 6d.

A Smaller History of England, from the Earliest Times to the year 1868. With Coloured Maps and 68 Woodcuts. 16mo, 3s. 6d.

A Smaller History of English Literature; giving a Sketch of the Lives of our chief Writers. 16mo, 3s. 6d.

Short Specimens of English Literature. Selected from the chief Authors, and arranged chronologically. 16mo, 3s. 6d.

MURRAY'S STUDENT'S MANUALS.

A Series of Historical Class Books for advanced Scholars. Forming a complete chain of History from the earliest ages to modern times.

Student's Old Testament History, from the Creation to the Return of the Jews from Captivity. With an Introduction by PHILIP SMITH. Maps and Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's New Testament History. With an Introduction connecting the History of the Old and New Testaments. By PHILIP SMITH. Maps and Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's Manual of Ecclesiastical History of the Christian Church, PART I.—From the Times of the Apostles to the full Establishment of the Holy Roman Empire and the Papal Power. PART II.—The Middle Ages and the Reformation. By PHILIP SMITH. Woodcuts. 2 vols. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d. each.

Student's Manual of English Church History. FIRST PERIOD—From the Planting of the Church in Britain to the Accession of Henry VIII. SECOND PERIOD—From the Time of Henry VIII. to the Silencing of Convocation in the 18th Century. By Canon PERRY, M.A. 2 vols. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d. each.

Student's Ancient History of the East. Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, Media, Persia, Phœnicia, &c. By PHILIP SMITH. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's History of Greece, from the Earliest Times to the Roman Conquest; with the History of Literature and Art. By Dr. WM. SMITH. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's History of Rome, from the Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Empire; with the History of Literature and Art. By Dean LIDDELL. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. By EDWARD GIBBON. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's History of Modern Europe. From the End of the Middle Ages to the Treaty of Berlin, 1878. Post 8vo. [*In Preparation.*

Student's History of England from the Accession of Henry VII. to the Death of George II. By HENRY HALLAM. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's Hume: a History of ENGLAND from the Invasion of JULIUS CÆSAR to the Revolution in 1688. New edition. Continued to the Treaty of Berlin, 1878. By J. S. BREWER. With 7 Coloured Maps and Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's History of Europe during the MIDDLE AGES. By HENRY HALLAM. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's History of France, from the Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Second Empire, 1852. By Rev. W. H. JERVIS. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's Manual of Ancient Geography. By Canon BEVAN. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's Manual of Modern Geography, Mathematical, Physical, and Descriptive. By Canon BEVAN. Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's Manual of the Geography of India. By Dr. GEORGE SMITH. Post 8vo.

Student's Manual of the English Language. By GEORGE P. MARSH. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's Manual of English Literature. By T. B. SHAW. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's Specimens of English LITERATURE. By T. B. SHAW. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Student's Manual of Moral Philosophy. By WILLIAM FLEMING. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Student's Manual of the Evidences of Christianity. By HENRY WACE, M.A. Post 8vo.

The Student's History of the Roman Empire, from the Establishment of the Empire to the Accession of Commodus, A.D. 180. Post 8vo.

*** This Work will take up the History at the point at which Dean Liddell leaves off, and carry it down to the period at which Gibbon begins.

MARKHAM'S HISTORIES.

A History of England, from the First Invasion by the Romans to 1878. With Conversations at the end of each Chapter. By Mrs. MARKHAM. With 100 Woodcuts. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

A History of France, from the Conquest by the Gauls to 1878. With Conversations at the end of each Chapter. By Mrs. MARKHAM. Woodcuts. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

A History of Germany, from the Invasion of the Kingdom by the Romans under Marius to 1880. On the Plan of Mrs. MARKHAM. With 50 Woodcuts. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Little Arthur's History of England. By Lady CALLCOTT. Continued down to the year 1878. With 36 Woodcuts. 16mo, 1s. 6d.

DR. WM. SMITH'S EDUCATIONAL WORKS.

ENGLISH COURSE.

A Primary History of Britain for Elementary Schools. Edited by Dr. WM. SMITH. 12mo, 2s. 6d.

A School Manual of English Grammar, with Copious Exercises. By Dr. WM. SMITH and T. D. HALL. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

A Primary English Grammar for Elementary Schools. With 134 Exercises and Questions. By T. D. HALL. 16mo, 1s.

A Manual of English Composition. With Copious Illustrations and Practical Exercises. By T. D. HALL. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

A School Manual of Modern Geography, Physical and Political. By JOHN RICHARDSON. Post 8vo, 5s.

A Smaller Manual of Modern Geography, for Schools and Young Persons. 16mo, 2s. 6d.

LATIN COURSE.

The Young Beginner's First Latin Book; Containing the Rudiments of Grammar, Easy Grammatical Questions and Exercises, with Vocabularies. Being Introductory to Principia Latina, Part I. 12mo, 2s.

The Young Beginner's Second Latin Book; Containing an Easy Latin Reading Book, with an Analysis of the Sentences, Notes, and a Dictionary. Being Introductory to Principia Latina, Part II. 12mo, 2s.

Principia Latina, Part I. A First Latin Course, comprehending Grammar, Delectus, and Exercise Book, with Vocabularies. With Accidence adapted to the Ordinary Grammars, as well as the Public School Latin Primer. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Appendix to Principia Latina, Part I.; Additional Exercises, with Examination Papers. 12mo, 2s. 6d.

Principia Latina, Part II. A Latin Reading Book, an Introduction to Ancient Mythology, Geography, Roman Antiquities, and History. With Notes and Dictionary. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Principia Latina, Part III. A Latin Poetry Book, containing Easy Hexameters and Pentameters, Eclogæ Ovidianæ, Latin Prosody, First Latin Verse Book. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Principia Latina, Part IV. Latin Prose Composition, containing the Rules of Syntax, with copious Examples, and Exercises. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Principia Latina, Part V. Short Tales and Anecdotes from Ancient History, for Translation into Latin Prose. 12mo, 3s.

A Latin-English Vocabulary: arranged according to subjects and etymology; with a Latin-English Dictionary to Phædrus, Cornelius Nepos, and Cæsar's "Gallic War." 12mo, 3s. 6d.

The Student's Latin Grammar. Post 8vo, 6s.

A Smaller Latin Grammar. Abridged from the above. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Tacitus. Germania, Agricola, and First Book of the Annals. English Notes. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

GREEK COURSE.

Initia Græca, Part I. A First Greek Course: comprehending Grammar, Delectus, and Exercise-book. With Vocabularies. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Appendix to Initia Græca, Part I.—Additional Exercises, with Examination Papers and Easy Reading Lessons, with the Sentences analysed, serving as an Introduction to Part II. 12mo, 2s. 6d.

Initia Græca, Part II. A Greek Reading Book, containing Short Tales, Anecdotes, Fables, Mythology, and Grecian History. Arranged in a systematic progression, with Lexicon. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Initia Græca. Part III. Greek Prose Composition: containing a Systematic Course of Exercises on the Syntax, with the Principal Rules of Syntax, and an English-Greek Vocabulary to the Exercises. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

The Student's Greek Grammar. By Professor CURTIUS. Post 8vo, 6s.

A Smaller Greek Grammar. Abridged from the above. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Greek Accidence. Extracted from the above work. 12mo, 2s. 6d.

Elucidations of Curtius's Greek Grammar. Translated by EVELYN ABBOTT. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Plato. The Apology of Socrates, the Crito, and Part of the Phædo; with Notes in English from Stallbaum, and Schleiermacher's Introductions. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

FRENCH, GERMAN, AND ITALIAN COURSE.

French Principia, Part I. A First French Course, containing Grammar, Delectus, and Exercises, with Vocabularies and materials for French Conversation. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Appendix to French Principia, Part I. Being Additional Exercises and Examination Papers. 12mo, 2s. 6d.

French Principia, Part II. A Reading Book, with Notes, and a Dictionary. 12mo, 4s. 6d.

Student's French Grammar: Practical and Historical. By C. HERON-WALL. With Introduction by M. Littré. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

A Smaller Grammar of the French Language. Abridged from the above. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

German Principia, Part I. A First German Course, containing Grammar, Delectus, Exercises, and Vocabulary. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

German Principia. Part II. A Reading Book, with Notes and a Dictionary. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Practical German Grammar. With an Historical development of the Language. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

The Italian Principia, Part I. A First Course, containing a Grammar, Delectus, Exercise Book, with Vocabularies, and Materials for Italian Conversation. By Signor RICCI. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Italian Principia, Part II. A Reading-Book, containing Fables, Anecdotes, History, and Passages from the best Italian Authors, with Grammatical Questions, Notes, and a Copious Etymological Dictionary. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

SCHOOL AND PRIZE BOOKS.

A Child's First Latin Book, comprising a full Praxis of Nouns, Adjectives, and Pronouns, with Active Verbs. By T. D. HALL. 16mo, 2s.

King Edward VI.'s Latin Accidence. 12mo, 2s. 6d.

King Edward VI.'s Latin Grammar. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Oxenham's English Notes for Latin Elegiacs. Designed for early proficients in the art of Latin Versification. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Hutton's Principia Græca: an Introduction to the study of Greek, comprehending Grammar, Delectus, and Exercise Book, with Vocabularies. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Buttmann's Lexilogus; a Critical Examination of the Meaning and Etymology of Passages in Greek Writers. 8vo, 12s.

Matthiæ's Greek Grammar. Revised by CROOKE. Post 8vo, 4s.

Horace. With 100 Vignettes. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Practical Hebrew Grammar; with an Appendix, containing the Hebrew Text of Genesis I. VI. and Psalms I. VI. Grammatical Analysis and Vocabulary. By Rev. STANLEY LEATHES. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

First Book of Natural Philosophy: an Introduction to the Study of Statics, Dynamics, Hydrostatics, Light, Heat, and Sound. By Prof. NEWTH. Sm. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Elements of Mechanics, including Hydrostatics. By Prof. NEWTH. Sm. 8vo, 8s. 6d.

Mathematical Examples. A Graduated Series of Elementary Examples in Arithmetic, Algebra, Logarithms, Trigonometry, and Mechanics. By Professor NEWTH. Small 8vo, 8s. 6d.

Progressive Geography. By J. W. CROKER. 18mo, 1s. 6d.

Æsop's Fables, chiefly from Original Sources, by Rev. THOS. JAMES. With 100 Woodcuts. Post 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Gleanings in Natural History. By EDWARD JESSE. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Philosophy in Sport made Science in Earnest; or Natural Philosophy inculcated by the Toys and Sports of Youth. By Dr. PARIS. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Puss in Boots. By OTTO SPECKTER. Illustrations. 16mo, 1s. 6d.

The Charmed Roe. By OTTO SPECKTER. Illustrations. 16mo, 5s.

Hymns in Prose for Children. by Mrs. BARBAULD. Illustrations. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

A Boy's Voyage Round the World. By SAMUEL SMILES. Illustrations. Small 8vo, 6s.

The Home & Colonial Library.

Class A—BIOGRAPHY, HISTORY, &c.

1. DRINKWATER'S Gibraltar. 2s.
2. The Amber Witch. 2s.
3. SOUTHEY'S Cromwell and Bunyan. 2s.
4. BARROW'S Sir Francis Drake. 2s.
5. British Army at Washington. 2s.
6. French in Algiers. 2s.
7. Fall of the Jesuits. 2s.
8. Livonian Tales. 2s.
9. Condé. By Lord MAHON. 3s. 6d.
10. Sale's Brigade in Affghanistan. 2s.
11. Sieges of Vienna. 2s.
12. MILMAN'S Wayside Cross. 2s.
13. Liberation War in Germany. 3s. 6d.
14. GLEIG'S Battle of Waterloo. 3s. 6d.
15. STEFFENS' Adventures. 2s.
16. CAMPBELL'S British Poets. 3s. 6d.
17. Essays. By Lord MAHON. 3s. 6d.
18. GLEIG'S Life of Lord Clive. 3s. 6d.
19. Stokers and Pokers. By Sir FRANCIS HEAD. 2s.
20. GLEIG'S Life of Munro. 3s. 6d.

Class B—VOYAGES and TRAVEL.

1. BORROW'S Bible in Spain. 3s. 6d.
2. BORROW'S Gipsies of Spain. 3s. 6d.
3. 4. HEBER'S Indian Journals. 7s.
5. Holy Land. IRBY & MANGLES. 2s.
6. HAY'S Western Barbary. 2s.
7. Letters from the Baltic. 2s.
8. MEREDITH'S New S. Wales. 2s.
9. LEWIS' West Indies. 2s.
10. MALCOLM'S Persia. 3s. 6d.
11. Father Ripa at Pekin. 2s.
12, 13. MELVILLE'S Marquesas 7s.
14. ABBOT'S Missionary in Canada. 2s.
15. Letters from Madras. 2s.
16. ST. JOHN'S Highland Sports. 3s. 6d.
17. The Pampas. Sir F. HEAD. 2s.
18. FORD'S Spanish Gatherings. 3s. 6d.
19. EDWARDS' River Amazon. 2s.
20. ACLAND'S India. 2s.
21. RUXTON'S RockyMountains. 3s 6d
22. CARNARVON'S Portugal. 3s. 6d.
23. HAYGARTH'S Bush Life. 2s.
24. ST. JOHN'S Libyan Desert. 2s.
25. Letters from Sierra Leone. 3s. 6d

DR. WM. SMITH'S ANCIENT ATLAS.

AN ATLAS OF ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY, BIBLICAL AND CLASSICAL. Intended to illustrate the 'Dictionary of the Bible,' and the 'Dictionaries of Classical Antiquity.' Compiled under the superintendence of WM. SMITH, D.C.L., and GEORGE GROVE, LL.D. Folio, half-bound, £6 : 6s.

1. Geographical Systems of the Ancients.
2. The World as known to the Ancients.
3. Empires of the Babylonians, Lydians, Medes, and Persians.
4. Empire of Alexander the Great.
5, 6. Kingdoms of the Successors of Alexander the Great.
7. The Roman Empire in its greatest extent.
8. The Roman Empire after its division into the Eastern and Western Empires.
9. Greek and Phœnician Colonies.
10. Britannia.
11. Hispania.
12. Gallia.
13. Germania, Rhætia, Noricum.
14. Pæonia, Thracia, Mœsia, Illyria, Dacia.
15. Italy, Sardinia, and Corsica.
16. Italia Superior.
17. Italia Inferior.
18. Plan of Rome.
19. Environs of Rome.
20. Greece after the Doric Migration.
21. Greece during the Persian Wars.
22. Greece during the Peloponnesian War.
23. Greece during the Achæan League.
24. Northern Greece.
25. Central Greece—Athens.
26. Peloponnesus.—With Plan of Sparta.
27. Shores and Islands of the Ægean Sea.
28. Historical Maps of Asia Minor.
29. Asia Minor.
30. Arabia.
31. India.
32. Northern Part of Africa.
33. Ægypt and Æthiopia.
34. Historical Maps of the Holy Land.
35, 36. The Holy Land. North and South.
37. Jerusalem, Ancient and Modern.
38. Environs of Jerusalem.
39. Sinai.
40. Asia, to illustrate the Old Testament.
41. Map, to illustrate the New Testament.
42, 43. Plans of Babylon, Nineveh, Troy, Alexandria, and Byzantium.

INDEX.

ABERCROMBIE'S Works - 20
Acland's India - - 8
Admiralty Manual - 16
Æsop's Fables - - 22
Agricultural Journal - 25
Albert (The) Memorial - 18
—— Speeches - - 21
Army Lists - - - 24
Austin's Jurisprudence - 20

BARBAULD'S Hymns - 29
Barclay's Talmud - - 14
Barkley's Turkey - - 10
—— My Boyhood - - 25
Barrow's Autobiography 7
Barry's (Sir C.) Life - 7, 20
—— (Canon), Witness for Christ - - - - 15
—— (E.) Architecture - 19
Bates' River Amazon - 11
Bax's Eastern Seas - 8
Beckett's (Sir E.) Revised N. T. - - - - - 15
Bees and Flowers - - 25
Bell's (Sir Charles) Letters 6
Bell's Tower of London 5
Bertram's Harvest of the Sea - - - - - 17
Bible Commentary - 2
Bigg Wither's Brazil - 11
Bird's Sandwich Islands 10
—— Japan - - - 9
—— Rocky Mountains - 10
Bisset's Sport in Africa 9, 25
Blackstone's Comments - 20
Blunt's Works - - 15
—— (Lady A.), Bedouins, &c. - - - - - 10
Borrow's Works - 11, 22
Boswell's Johnson - 7
Brewer's Studies 4, 5, 22, 27
British Association - 16
Brugsch's Egypt - - 3
Bunbury's Geography - 11
Burbidge's Borneo 10, 17
Burckhardt's Cicerone 12, 19
Burn's Nav. & Mil. Terms 24
Burrows' Constitution - 20
Buttmann's Works - 29
Buxton's Memoirs, &c. - 6
Buxton's Political Handbk. 20
Byles on Religion - - 15
Byron's Life - - - 7
—— Poetical Works - 23

CAMPBELL'S Chancellors and Chief-Justices - 8
—— Life - - - 8
Campbell's Napoleon - 7
Carnarvon's Athens - 10
—— Agamemnon - - 23
Cartwright's Jesuits 4, 16
Cathedral (The) - - 15
Cathedrals of England 1, 4, 19
Cesnola's Cyprus - 10, 18
Chaplin's Benedicite - 16
Chisholm's Polar Seas - 11
Choice of a Dwelling 20, 25
Church and the Age - 15
Churton's Poetical Works 23
Classic Preachers - - 15
Clode's Military Forces 24
—— Martial Law - - 20
Coleridge's Table-Talk - 22
Cookery - - - 25
Cooke's Sketches - - 1
Cook's Sermons - - 16
Crabbe's Life and Works 23
Crawford's Argo - - 23
Cripps on Plate - - 18
Croker's Geography - 29
Crowe's Flemish Painters 19
—— Painting in Italy - 19
—— Titian - - - 7, 19
Cumming's South Africa 9, 25
Currie, Divinity of Christ 15
Curzon's Monasteries - 10
Curtius' Works - - 22
Cust's Annals of the Wars 24

DARWIN'S Works - - 17
—— (Erasmus), Life - 8
Davy's Consolations - 21
—— Salmonia - - 25
De Cosson's Blue Nile - 9
Dennis' Etruria - - 19
Dent's Sudeley - - 5
Derby's Homer - - 23
Derry's Bampton - - 15
Deutsch's Talmud - 21
Dilke's Papers of a Critic 22
Douglas's Gunnery and Bridges - - - 24
—— Horse-Shoeing - 25
Ducange's Dictionary - 21
Du Chaillu's Africa - 9
—— Midnight Sun - 11
Dufferin's High Latitudes 11
—— Speeches, &c. 20, 22
Duncan's Artillery - 5, 24
—— English in Spain - 5, 24
Dürer, Albert - - 7, 19

EASTLAKE'S Essays - 7
Eldon's Life - - - 8
Elgin's Letters - - 7
Ellis's Madagascar - 9
—— Memoir - - - 6
Ellis's Catullus - 23
Elphinstone's India - 5
Elphinstone's Turning - 17
Elton's Eastern Africa - 9
Elze's Byron - - - 7
English in Spain - - 5, 24
Essays on Cathedrals - 15

FERGUSSON'S Architectural Works - - 19
Forbes' Burma - - 8
Forsyth's Hortensius - 20
—— Novels and Novelists 21
Foss' Biographia Juridica 8
Frere's India and Africa 21
—— Deccan Days - - 22

GALTON'S Art of Travel 11
Geographical Journal - 11
George's Mosel & Loire 11
Gibbon's Roman Empire 3, 27
Giffard's Naval Deeds - 24
Gill's Ascension - 9, 16
—— River of Golden Sand 8
Gladstone's Rome - - 16
—— Essays - - 20, 22
Gleig's Waterloo - - 5
—— Washington - - 5
Glynne's Churches - 19
Goldsmith's Works - 23
Gomm's Life - - - 7
Grey's Wm. IVth - - 6
Grote's Histories - - 3
—— Works - - 20, 21
—— Life - - - - 7
—— Mrs. - - - - 7

HALLAM'S England - 4
—— Middle Ages - - 4
—— Literary History - 22
—— (Arthur), Remains - 23
Hall's English Grammar 28
—— First Latin Book - 29
Hamilton's Rheinsberg - 6
Handbooks for Travellers 12, 14
Hatch's Aristotle - - 21
Hatherley on Scripture - 15
Hayward's Statesmen - 6
Head's Engineer - - 24
—— Burgoyne - - 7
—— Bubbles from Nassau 11
—— Stokers and Pokers 22
Heber's Poetical Works 15, 23
Herries' Life - - 6
Herschel's Memoir - 8
Hollway's Norway - 11
Home and Colonial Library 30
Homer's Iliad, Odyssey 23
Hook's Church Dictionary 14
Hook's (Theodore) Life 6
Hope's (B.) Worship - 16
Houghton's Monographs 6
—— Poetical Works - 23
Houstoun's Wild West - 11
Hutchinson's Dog-Breaking 25
Hutton's Principia Græca 29

JAMESON'S Ital. Painters 7, 19
Jennings' Field Paths and Rambles - - 11, 22
Jervis's Gallican Church 4, 15
Jesse's Gleanings - - 17
Jex-Blake's Sermons - 16
Johnson's (Dr.) Life 7
Julian's Dictionary of Hymnology - - 14
Junius' Handwriting - 22

KERR'S Country House 20, 25
King Edward VIth's Grammars - - - 29
Kirk's Charles the Bold 4
Kirkes' Physiology - 17
Kugler's Italian Schools 19
—— German Schools - 19

LANE'S Modern Egyptians, 4, 9
Lawrence's Reminiscences 7
Layard's Nineveh - - 9
Leathes' Heb. Grammar 29
Leslie's Hbk. for Painters 19

Levi's British Commerce 21
Lex Salica - - - 21
Liddell's Rome - - 3, 27
Lispings from Low Latitudes - - - - 22
Little Arthur's England 27
Livingstone's Travels - 9
—— Life - - - 6
Livingstonia - - - 9
Loch's China - - 5
Lockhart's Spanish Ballads 23
Loudon's Gardening - 25
Lyell's Works - - 18
—— Life - - - 8
Lyell's Handbook of Ferns 17
Lytton's Julian Fane - 6

M'Clintock's Arctic Seas 11
Macdougall's Warfare - 24
Macgregor's Rob Roy - 10
Madras, Letters from - 8
Mahon's Belisarius - 7
Maine's (Sir H. S.) Works 21
Malcolm's Persia - - 10
Mansel's Lectures - - 21
—— Bampton Lectures - 15
—— Letters, Reviews, &c. 21
Marco Polo's Travels - 8
Markham's Histories - 27
—— (C. R.), Cinchona - 25
Marryat's Pottery - - 18
Masters in Theology - 15
Matthiæ's Greek Gram. 29
Mayo's Sport in Abyssinia 9, 25
Meade's New Zealand - 10
Melville's Typee and Omoo 10
Meredith's New So. Wales 10
Michel Angelo - - 7, 19
Middleton's Rembrandt 19
Millington's Land of Ham 14
Milman's Histories - 4, 16
—— St. Paul's - - 5, 14
—— Christianity - - 4, 16
—— Latin Christianity - 4, 14
—— Fall of Jerusalem - 23
—— Horace - - - 7, 23
—— (Bishop), Life of - 6
Mivart's Essays - - 17
—— The Cat - - 17
Moore's Life of Byron - 7
Moresby's New Guinea 10
Mossman's Japan - - 8
Motley's Histories - 4
—— Barneveld - - 4, 6
Mounsey's Satsuma Rebellion - - - - 8
Mozley's Predestination 15
Muirhead's Vaux-de-Vire 23
Murchison's Siluria - 18
—— Memoirs - - 8
Music and Dress - - 25
Musters' Patagonians - 11

Napier's English Battles 5
Nautical Almanack - 24
Navy List - - - 24
New Testament - - 14
Newth's Works on Science 16
Nicholls, Sir G., Poor Laws 21
Nicolas' Historic Peerage 5
Nile Gleanings (Stuart) 3, 9, 18
Nimrod - - - - 25
Nordhoff's Communistic Societies - - 11, 20
Northcotes's Note-Book 5

Owen's Modern Artillery 24
Oxenham's Latin Elegiacs 29

Paget's Crimea - - 24
Palgrave's Taxation - 21
Palliser's Monuments - 22
Parkyns' Abyssinia - 9
Peel's Memoirs - - 6
Percy's Metallurgy - 16
Perry's St. Hugh - - 6
Phillip's Literary Essays 22
Philosophy in Sport - 16
Pollock's Family Prayers 14
Pope's Works - - 23
Porter's Damascus - 10
Prayer-Book - - - 14
Privy Council Judgments 21
Puss in Boots - - - 29

Quarterly Review - 21

Rae's Barbary - - 9
—— White Sea - - 11
Rassam's Abyssinia - 9
Rawlinson's Herodotus 3
—— Ancient Monarchies 3
—— Russia in the East 10, 20
Redcliffe (Lord S. de), Eastern Question - - - 20
Reed's Shipbuilding, &c. 16
—— Japan - - - 9
Rejected Addresses - 23
Reynold's Life - - 7
Ricardo's Works - - 21
Robertson's Church History - - - - 4, 15
Robson's School Architecture - - - 20
Robinson's Palestine 10, 15
—— Physical Geography 18
—— (W.), Alpine Flowers 25
—— Sub-Tropical Garden 25
—— Wild Garden - - 25
Rochester's (Bp.) Charge, 1881 - - - - - 15
Rowland's Constitution 20
—— Laws of Nature - 20

St. James' Lectures - 15
St. John's Wild Sports - 25
—— Libyan Desert - 9
Saldanha's Memoirs - 7
Sale's Brigade in Affghanistan - - - - - 5
Scepticism in Geology - 18
Schliemann's Troy and Mycenæ - - - 9, 18
Schomberg's Odyssey - 23
School and Prize Books - 29
Scott's Architecture - 19
Seebohm's Siberia - 11, 17
Selborne on the Liturgy 4, 15
Shadows of Sick Room - 15
Simmons' Court-Martial 20
Smiles' Popular Biographies and Works 5, 6, 8, 18, 22, 25, 29
Smith (Dr. G.), Geography of India - - - 8
Smith (P.) Ancient History 3, 4
Smith's (Dr. Wm.) Dictionaries 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 14, 26
—— Ancient Atlas 11, 30
—— Educational Course 3, 28
—— Smaller Histories 16, 26
Somerville's Life - - 8
Somerville's Physical Sciences, &c. - - - 16, 18
South's Household Surgery - - - 17, 25
Staël, Madame de - - 6
Stanhope's Histories - 5
—— Pitt - - - 6
—— Miscellanies - - 22
—— Retreat from Moscow - - - 5, 22
Stanley's Sinai - - 10
—— Bible in Holy Land 10
—— Eastern, Jewish, and Scottish Church - - 4, 16
—— Canterbury - - 4
—— Westminster Abbey 5
—— Sermons in East - 16
——— at Westminster 16
—— the Beatitudes - 16
—— Arnold - - - 6
—— Corinthians - - 16
—— Christian Institutions 15
Stevens's Madame de Staël 6
Stephens's Chrysostom - 6
Stories for Children - 29
Street's Architectural Works 19
Stuart's Nile - - 3, 9, 18
Student's Manuals 14, 26, 28
Sumner's Life - - 6
Swainson's Creeds - 15
Swift's Life - - - 7
Sybel's French Revolution 5
Symonds' Records of the Rocks - - - - 18

Temple's India - - 8, 21
Thibaut's Musical Art 19
Thielmann's Caucasus - 10
Thomson's Sermons 15, 16
Titian's Life and Times 7, 19
Tocqueville's France - 5
Tomlinson's Sonnet - 23
Tozer's Turkey & Greece 10
Tristram's Land of Moab 10
—— Great Sahara - - 9
Truro (Bp. of), The Cathedral, &c. - - - 15
Turkey, Lady's Life in - 10
Tylor's Primitive Culture 21
Tylor's Hist. of Mankind 21

Van Lennep's Asia Minor 9
—— Bible Lands - - 15
Vatican Council - - 16
Virchow's Freedom of Science - - - 17

Wace's Gospel and its Witnesses - - - 14
Weigall's Princess Charlotte - - - - - 6
Wellington's Despatches 5, 24
White's Naval Architecture 24
Whymper's Matterhorn - 11
Wilberforce's Life - - 6
Wilkinson's Egyptians - 3
Wilson's Life and Diary 7
—— (Dr. John), Life of 6
Wilson's Michel Angelo - 7, 19
Wood's Oxus - - - 8
Words of Human Wisdom 22

Young's Nyassa - - 9
Yule's Marco Polo - - 8
—— (A. F.), Crete - - 21

DATE DUE

[redacted]

MAR 31 '81

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

BS2569.2 .C77
The revised version of the first three
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00060 7731